

The LUTHERAN CHURCH QUARTERLY

JANUARY, 1929

INAUGURAL ADDRESS¹

L. FRANKLIN GRUBER
MAYWOOD, ILL.

Mr. President and Members of the Board of Directors, Representatives of Educational Institutions and Representatives of the Church, Faculty and Students, Christian Friends:

It is because of a time-honored precedent on such an occasion that one feels constrained to deviate from his usual custom of speaking without notes. If he should therefore be less free and spontaneous than usual, in what he has to say, it may be attributed to the fact that he is resorting to an art which he has not been practicing.

If this even had taken place a little over a year ago, I should have had to speak as one viewing virtually from the outside the institution to whose presidency I have been called. Today I am able to speak as one who views it also from within. Now, as one who looks outward can see farther than one who looks inward, in a real sense my present viewpoint enables me to see more than would have been the case a year ago. It is now possible for me to see more clearly and to understand better than a year ago a few of the problems and some of the possibilities of Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary, problems that must be solved so that its possibilities may become actualities.

1 Delivered on the occasion of his inauguration as President of The Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary, December 11, 1928.

CHANGE IN THE EDUCATIONAL WORLD

The last quarter of a century has witnessed a great change in the educational world. Institutions of secular education have grown by leaps and bounds, and some new ones have arisen almost over night. Then, too, specialization has caused the emphasis to be placed more and more upon the less and less, until the less has threatened almost to reach the vanishing point. The German professor's dying statement that if he had to live his life over again he would devote it entirely to a study of the *iota subscript* now seems almost like a prophecy of this present tendency in education. Thus what might be called the telescopic view in education has been superseded by what might be called the microscopic view. Extensiveness has given way to intensiveness.

The day of the universal or encyclopaedic scholar of many things is gone; the day of the technical specialist with his more intimate knowledge of a few things is here. This somewhat gradual, but almost revolutionary, change has been just what we might have expected, as it has simply kept pace with its parallel in the industrial world, where in some cases twenty men are now employed to do the work which was but a twentieth part of the task of one man in the days of yore.

This tendency toward specialization, even though it is on a much smaller scale, has made itself felt also in the field of theology. It, too, is developing its specialists, not only along departmental lines, but also along some lines of more or less minute departmental subdivisions.

THE AVERAGE MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL NOT A SPECIALIST

While it is true that specialization has made itself felt also in theology, nevertheless, because of the active pastor's wide range of contacts and because of the variety of the needs of those to whom he would minister, and therefore because of the consequent multiplicity of problems with which he is confronted, specialization, in the stricter sense of that word, has not to any great extent entered the rank and file of the actual ministry of the gospel. It

is true that there are among active pastors some notable exceptions of outstanding specialists on certain subjects. But such exceptions are due generally to a happily chosen avocation as a sort of safety valve for relief from the strenuous duties of the real vocation as a life-work. Such specialization as may be found in theology is, therefore, quite naturally confined largely to the teaching classes, and to that smaller group of investigators whose chief aim is the attainment of truth for truth's sake.

The chief function of specialization in theology is, therefore, rather that of preparing an all-around gospel ministry, so as to match the universal needs, and to meet the ever-increasing number of problems of a yearning world. I do not mean that special preparation is not necessary for special work along lines of religious education, inner mission and social service, and the like, but that the average pastor must have a wide general training rather than, or before, one along a special line. His work is in a widespread field rather than along one of its single pathways. As the more general purpose of the theological seminary is, therefore, to prepare ministers of the gospel rather than specialists in certain subjects in theology, most seminaries must confine themselves to that somewhat general task.

Thus while the day of the universal scholar in the liberal arts and sciences is past, at least a vestige of that day is still left in the ministry of the church.

THE NEED OF A WELL TRAINED MINISTRY

There was a time in the early history of our country—and this was true of our own American Lutheran church—when an able pastor, who in some cases was imported from the Old World, might direct the theological studies of young men of good parts, to whom that pastor was the whole theological faculty and what might be called the clinical director all in one. Now the young man who enters the ministry is the intellectual, moral, and spiritual product of an ever-increasing number of academic and theological experts. The composite scholarship of the

pew demands this of the pulpit. The educated laity of this generation will hardly be satisfied with the mere exhortations "to be good" of generations ago.

An empty church is now more and more being associated with an empty preacher. By this I do not mean to say that mere intellectual attainment is the only, or even the most important, qualification of the preacher, and that intellectual emptiness is the only kind of emptiness. There must, of course, also be emotional and spiritual depths in the preacher if he would touch the emotions of his hearers and move them to righteous action. "His soul must overflow if he another's soul would reach; it takes the overflow of hearts to give the lips full speech." Indeed, a well-balanced emotional nature constitutes another primary qualification of the preacher, without which his preaching would be largely an intellectual exercise for instruction and entertainment. But when adequate intellectual qualifications are in proper balance with emotional and spiritual qualifications, the preacher's message has a solidity and a power that make it almost irresistible. The emotional and the spiritual qualifications are the explosive force that drives home the intellectual shafts of conviction to head and heart.

THE CHALLENGE OF THE MINISTRY

There was a time when the clergy constituted almost an intellectual aristocracy, and this in spite of the somewhat elementary preparation in those days. The minister was looked up to as the man who knew. The brightest and best young men were early singled out as possible candidates for this high calling. But with the increasing of the standards of the other so-called learned professions, and with the more general diffusion of knowledge, the minister is gradually finding himself face to face with men and women in the pew who, along some lines, are his intellectual equals, and even his superiors.

Within recent years there has been a growing tendency to think of the ministry, with its religion and theology, in terms of opinion and faith, and to think of the other

professions in terms of facts and knowledge, as if there were no facts and knowledge in religion and no opinion and faith in the other professions. And yet, as Descartes' argument from consciousness or conscious thinking has greater validity as a proof of one's personal existence than any argument from environment, so man's religious yearnings and aspirations should more surely have their counterpart in the reality that meets and satisfies them than the things that match his physical senses, or that in any way affect his physical sensorium. It is thus seen that the highest values must be spiritual and moral values, as also they are the most abiding. But these greater values are unfortunately too often eclipsed in the choice of a life-work by lesser values that are closer to the vision.

Moreover, while the financial returns of the ministry have quite generally limited life virtually to bare existence, those of the other professions have made it possible to live in luxury and abundance.

There has, therefore, been a tendency among the brightest young men to enter the secular professions. In some cases parents have even shared this viewpoint of their sons and have rather urged the brighter and stronger son to take up medicine or law, or something else, because they have believed he would succeed, while the one less gifted intellectually and weaker physically has sometimes been urged to enter the ministry, as supposedly the line of easiest resistance for him. Thus, at times, income on the part of some, or ease on the part of others, has determined the choice of a life-work. As some people have somehow felt or acted as though religion was rather for invalids and women than for virile red-blooded men, so some have had a lurking notion that the gospel ministry was not for the strong physically or mentally, who might somehow succeed better, according to their definition of success, in some other profession.

But to think of religion and of its ministry in such terms, is to lose sight of the fact that religion has always been, and still is, the greatest force in the world, as also

it is man's greatest need. As the planets in their courses are drawn toward and held by the sun, so man is involuntarily drawn to God. And wherever man has lost the knowledge of the true God, he has been impelled by his very need of God, in image form or otherwise, to invent a god of his own. And Him, whom man would otherwise ignorantly worship, Holy Scripture, the textbook of the Christian minister, reveals to the world. Surely, no other life-work is so noble as that of an ambassador of Jesus Christ, the King of Kings, to this foreign world beneath high heaven.

Such an attitude toward the gospel ministry is, therefore, utterly out of tune with the facts in the case. Now, as never before, should the ministry attract the brightest and strongest. What I want to emphasize is that, however strongly the office of the ministry may appeal to others and however well they may succeed, there is no reason in the nature of the office why it should not appeal equally strongly also to the most athletic in physique, and to the most brilliant in intellect among the students of our foremost higher institutions of learning, unless to such as are otherwise unfitted and therefore not called of God. As God is worthy of the best of all things, men included, the church should number among its ministers more and more of the best leaders of men.

Surely, there is no greater field for service in the world's work. Surely, nowhere else is there so great a challenge to the man who is capable of leading a strenuous life. Surely, there is no calling that requires so much of a man's time and strength. Among the learned professions that of the ministry should be the most learned. It deals with the profoundest problems that have ever engaged the mind of man, problems whose solution is the burden and aim of all philosophy. What the philosopher seeks after, if haply he may find it, as the ultimate reality, the Christian minister has found in God, whom it is his exalted privilege to proclaim to an anxious world. Nor is there anything in the whole realm of nature that might not bear, or throw light, upon his theme. As all things

are from God, so all things point and lead to God, in whom all paths of investigation meet. Hence all truth can be made to serve God's messenger. Things that are seen are tangible illustrations of things that are not seen. The visible and temporal may thus serve as the image of the invisible and eternal.

THE MINISTER NEED NEVER FEAR, WHITHERSOEVER TRUTH
MAY LEAD

What I have just said may need a little further development. The works of God can never be in conflict with what is in truth the Word of God, whatever conflict there may be between our interpretations of these two sources of truth. Nor need the church ever be afraid of the issue, whithersoever truth may lead. Her motto may safely be as to both truth and the great Author of truth, "Where Thou leadest, I will follow." It is true that many a fainting heart may tremble and some may fall by the wayside, but the danger is not in the truth but in those who fear for its safety.

Much has been said within recent years about the need of a reconstruction in theology. But as truth itself is necessarily unchangeable, such reconstruction cannot be one as to the essence of truth, but one only as to its accident, as to the form in which truth may by us be expressed, and as to our methods of search after truth and our application of truth to life; and this must needs affect its terminology. Of course, such a statement immediately calls forth the old question, What is truth? or What are those unchanging truths? Now while it is not my purpose, in this connection at least, to attempt to answer that question, it may be said that it is incumbent upon churches and individuals as conscientiously as possible to settle that question first, so as to have at least some consistent basis for such attempted reconstruction.

There is a sense in which the statement of truth varies with the ages. Thus certain truths expressed in the terminology of the twentieth century would have been unintelligible in the Mosaic age, and for that matter in every

other age before our own. So, presumably, certain truths expressed in the terminology of the thirtieth or the fiftieth century, would be unintelligible in our boasted twentieth century age of electricity or age of light. For example, in the light of our knowledge of a universe of galactic systems of suns, before whose magnitude, measurable only in the transcendent calculus of heaven, our imagination trembles and reels, we can now read vastly more into the first verse of Genesis with its *earth* and *heaven*, and into such terms as the *almightiness of God*, than was possible in the Mosaic, the Apostolic, the Nicene, or the Reformation age.

And yet, while our theological terminology and definitions of truths, first enunciated in the childhood language of the race, may thus change with successive ages, the truths themselves do not change. In fact, as to the Scriptures themselves, it is only by setting forth truth in merest outline, in simple universal language, that they could be the book for all ages. It is, therefore, only our expressions or formulas of truth that change, and these only as our understanding of such truth grows. There is thus a real sense in which much of our rich theological heritage should be interpreted in twentieth century terminology.

Much of the confusion in present-day theology has been due to a mistaking of the accidental form of expression of truth for its essence. Our expression of truth is a dynamic variable, a necessary human device or invention to assist us in understanding and transmitting its constant or unchangeable essence. In the attempt to restate truth, however, some scholars have inadvertently been blasting at the impregnable rock of truth itself, and thus at the Rock of Ages.

Moreover, the distinction between so-called fundamental truths and non-fundamental truths is not a constant, but a variable. What some men regard as a fundamental truth may by others be regarded as a non-fundamental truth; and, conversely, what some men regard as a non-fundamental truth may by others be regarded as a fun-

damental truth. According to almost any fixed definition of the word *fundamental*, a person may be so-called fundamentalist as to some things and a so-called modernist as to others. A so-called non-fundamental truth under one set of circumstances may prove even to be a fundamental truth under another set of circumstances. As such terms as *fundamentalism* and *modernism* are therefore indefinite in their meaning, they have only relative value, like the terms *orthodoxy* and *heterodoxy*. They mean little, therefore, except from the peculiar personal viewpoint of the one who uses them. Indeed, they have become shibboleths of condemnation, like the term *mad* applied to his dog by the Quaker who had conscientious scruples to kill his animal without first calling him by a bad name.

Much confusion has arisen from a disregard of these facts, as abundantly illustrated in utterances from pulpit and platform and in the voluminous controversial literature of these times. Indeed, a considerable part of the present scientifico-theological controversy is traceable to a lax use, or a confusion, of terms. For instance, as to the much debated question of *creation* there are those who, in their conscientious zeal for the conservation of truth, have made the *process* of creation fundamental, while in the final analysis, Scripture, after all, seems to make only the *fact* of creation fundamental. On such great questions we might therefore well withhold judgment, meanwhile awaiting more light.

Nature and *Scripture* cannot be in conflict, if both are from the same Author, however much our interpretations of them may conflict with each other. In fact, if both are from God, we might naturally expect them to be supplementary revelations. The one reveals the fact of creation; the other may gradually, to our diligent search, yield also something as to the process, at least as to mediate creation, a process whose impress may be traceable throughout universal nature. Now what I have just said should be suggestive of many other facts and truths that have a common denominator, or perhaps better a common divisor, in nature and Scripture.

And as for *science* and *religion* in the primary sense of that word, there never has been and there never will be any conflict between them, as they do not belong to the same category. The one refers to a personal relationship between man and God; the other is an attempt to understand God's works. Hence the church and the individual minister of the gospel need fear nothing from an alleged conflict between science and religion, as they need fear nothing from a supposed conflict between God's two revelations themselves, for there could be none. The perplexed trembling for the truth on the part of some men is often only a transfer of motion from their own trembling selves to the truth which is eternally fixed or unchangeable. As the voyager on the ocean sees the stars of heaven at night shuttling to and fro with every rolling billow, so some men see truth trembling upon its immovable throne. But as the voyager simply transfers his own swaying motion to the stars, so the apparent trembling of the truth is but a transfer of motion from men's own trembling hearts.

But as physical science is an interpretation of nature and as theology is an interpretation of Scripture, so long as all the accumulated science of the world is not a complete and perfect interpretation of nature and so long as the combined theology of the church is not a complete and perfect interpretation of Scripture, so long will there always be a conflict between *science* and *theology*. That is, as we shall never exhaust, or completely and perfectly understand, either of these two sources of truth, namely, *nature* and *Scripture*, there will always necessarily be a conflict between our two attempted interpretations of them in our *physical science* and our *theology*. But as these two branches of investigation, science and theology, approach more nearly to the truth in their respective realms, so should they necessarily more nearly approach each other. The theologian must therefore be somewhat more patient in his attitude toward at least the more assured results of science, while the man of science must not be too arrogant in his assumptions and too sure in his con-

clusions as to what must necessarily be but approximations to the truth.

The attempted scientific explanations as to how things came to take the form in which we find them should, in a superscientific age of the long distant future, be superseded by explanations much more nearly in consonance with the facts, as then more intimately known. As the human mind more correctly reads the thoughts of God after him, and more definitely traces his footsteps, in his created universe, much of the present apparent discord will gradually issue in a harmony not yet understood. Though we shall never find the eternal Chemist in his laboratory, or by searching be able to find out God, we can yet truthfully say that we have found, or can find, him by whom and through whom all things exist, and in whom we most literally live and move and have our being.

There have been times when the word *correlation* has been much upon the tongues of public school educators, and it surely is a word to be conjured with in the educational world. Thus history and geography are so related that history becomes truly intelligible in its correlation with geography, while geography becomes a living reality in its connection with history. If this is true of subjects whose facts or truths are related rather than identical, how much more should it surely be true of subjects at least partly having the same truths and facts common to both.

Therefore, as science and theology learn more and more to know each other and to understand each other's viewpoint, there should gradually be less and less antagonism and more co-operation between them in their respective attempts to attain the truth. As there is a real sense in which all other sciences can be made tributary to theology, theology in that same real sense must stand vindicated as the queen of all the sciences.

THE NEED OF PREPARATION

When any public speaker knows twenty times as much about a particular subject as the immediate occasion calls

for him to say, the nineteen times more than he does say will serve as so much inner pressure to drive home what he does say. The one-twentieth will express itself in his words; the nineteen-twentieths will flash in his eye, quiver in his emotions, and therefore tremble in the expression of his face and in his tongue and throb in the very fiber of his being. This is especially true of the minister of the gospel. The more intimately he is acquainted with that gospel, as well as with whatever facts and truths illustrate and reinforce it, and the more he has lived that gospel, the more assuring to himself and effective in others will be his message. It has been contended in illustration against this point, that an empty barrel makes more noise than a full one. But nothing can come out of even an empty barrel.

For the preacher to rely entirely upon the power of the Holy Spirit is for him to presume that the Spirit will supply what he has neglected or refused by his own efforts to acquire. The gift of tongues in our day is acquired through long years of consecrated effort. The more real the preparation which a minister can bring into his ministry, the more there is in him through which the Spirit of God can operate in the great work of the Kingdom. To say that the Apostles were not thus trained for their task, and that they spoke *merely* as the Spirit gave them utterance, is to ignore the fact that for three blessed years they sat at the feet of the greatest Teacher the world ever saw.

That the minister of the gospel should go through an adequate course of training and preparation for his life-work, must, therefore, be acknowledged by all, especially by those who take time to consider the greatness of his task. If there is any difference in the preparation for the several professions, surely the preparation of the minister should be the best, as his subject matter is the greatest and grandest and the end for which his preparation is intended is the most far-reaching. He should know not only *what* he is to preach and *how* he is to preach, but also *to whom* he is to preach.

He should know his Bible, both Old and New Testaments, as the great textbook of the church. He should have at least a fair working knowledge of its original Hebrew and Greek languages, so as to be able at first hand to determine its real meaning. He should know something of the times and circumstances under which the several books were written, as he should understand their background of world-history, so that he may be enabled better to understand their purposes and their messages. He should know the history of the church and the historical development of its doctrines. He should know the theology of his own church in particular and that of the other great church bodies in general. He should be acquainted with the conditions and needs of the non-Christian world, and with the long story of its seeking after God as bodied forth in the great ethnic religions. He should be familiar with the great philosophic systems and speculations within and without Christendom, and with the currents of modern scientific thought, so as to understand the problems that thus confront the church on every side. He must be able to meet the objector to religion in general, and to Christianity in particular. He must be able not only to give a reason for the hope and faith in himself, but also to defend and to steady the faith of many an honest doubting brother and sister. He must know contemporary history and understand the great currents and movements that are making history. He must know man and something of what is in man, psychologically and ethically, as well as religiously, considered. He should, moreover know himself, his strength and his weakness, how he can be the most efficient and effective instrument of the Spirit of God in the saving of souls.

Then, too, he must know how best to make *what* he knows most *effective* through word and act in serving his fellowmen and thus in serving God. He must develop the fine art of expression. To this end he must cultivate the best there is in literature. He should be not only a master of sentences, but even a master of words, in the language in which he clothes the thrilling thoughts of his

gospel message; and this is impossible for the English preacher without at least a root knowledge also of the Latin language. He should intimately be acquainted with what the ancient world called the trivium of the Liberal arts—grammar, rhetoric and logic—in order to give finished form and convincing power to his message. Then he must be able to help himself, by directing his own thinking and action. In short, he must thus *know* in order that, as the instrument of God, he may *do*.

But mere knowledge is not enough. It has indeed been said that knowledge is power, but that is only a half-truth. Knowledge itself is no more power than a library of books is education or wisdom, or than wheat in the granary is a crop. But as books and wheat must be intelligently used in their respective applications to attain that for which they are intended, so only intelligent *application* of knowledge is power. Only thus can the minister make, or rather enable God to make, his life count for the most in a world that needs such service. But to this end he must himself know and live close to God, whom he would bring close to others, and to Jesus Christ, whom to know is life eternal.

Surely, such a preparation for life-work is not an easy task, even as such life-work is not an easy task. This also should be a challenge to the brightest and strongest among the young men who are standing on the threshold of life-service. If less gifted and inadequately prepared men succeed in doing noble service in the ministry of the Kingdom, how much greater might be their service if they were better equipped for their work.

THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY AS THE TRAINING SCHOOL

For the adequate training of ministers, the church has made special provision in her theological seminaries. It is true that a considerable part of the work needed for the preparation which I have outlined is done before the student enters the seminary; nor can that preliminary training be too complex and solid. The best that our best schools for academic education can do in the way of

laying foundations is not too good. Then, upon such foundations, laid broad and deep, the theological seminary will be able to build a worthy professional and cultural superstructure.

Moreover, as the true end of all education is not so much instruction as it is culture, it would not be good pedagogy on the part of the theological seminary to put the chief stress upon the imparting of information, or upon doing all the thinking for the student. That would be the surest way to stifle originality and initiative on his part. What the student needs is the ability to help himself, to become a seeker after truth on his own account. Some students acquire this art of self-help quite early, others acquire it only after years devoted to extended supervised courses of study, while some never acquire it at all. Hence the theological seminary should be richly suggestive, rather than exhaustive, in its teaching. It should stimulate the student and make him crave for that which he has now learned to love. After all, in the great activities of life, one must act without a teacher. Hence, the inculcation of truth for truth's sake, and for the sake of life and character and service to God and man, and as an incentive to attain more truth, is more important than the reciting or mastering of elaborate skeletons, or of many volumes, of facts and truths.

The work of the ideal theological seminary is to result in more than merely *intellectual equipment*. It should issue in a full-rounded *Christian personality*. To the attainment of this, all its disciplines should be made tributary. The aim should not be scholarship for its own sake, as though it were an end in itself, but scholarship as a means to the more effective preaching of the gospel of the Kingdom.

THE NEEDS OF SUCH A SEMINARY

To do this abiding work in preparing men for the church, our theological seminaries must be strengthened. Indeed, there is a sense in which a church cannot expect to be stronger than her theological seminaries. What-

ever may be said of our church colleges, and they are doing a splendid work and are still furnishing the major part of our candidates for the ministry, their work is not as directly related to, and as vitally important for the church as is that of our seminaries. Even if one could conceive of the work of *pre-seminary preparation* being done in other than church colleges and through proper work of university student pastorates, surely no one could conceive of the church of the future being manned by *ministers* theologically and professionally trained outside of her theological seminaries. Things sacred have to struggle hard enough as it is to hold their proper place in religion and the church, without having to be left at the mercy of secular and state schools. And even if the church college should eventually go the way of the parochial school, as some have imagined, the theological seminary would abide as the theological and practical supply and power house of the church. As Christ's training of the disciples was an absolutely necessary part of his program for the work of establishing his Kingdom, so the church's program of carrying forward that work would utterly fail without her theological training schools. Surely, all will acknowledge, therefore, that the theological seminary is a *permanent* institution of the church, from which it is inseparable.

From what I have just said, it is evident, then, that in proportion to the care which the church bestows upon her theological seminaries, will she succeed in extending the Kingdom. If her support of the seminary is poor or half-hearted, she can blame only her own lack of interest if she is furnished with an inadequately trained ministry. It is difficult for even a theological seminary to make brick without straw.

To be a first-class institution, a theological seminary should have a first-class library suited to its needs. To make such a library adequately available to be of real service to its students, that library should be housed in a well-appointed modern library building. To acquire such a building, the church, or some one or more of her mem-

bers who understand the needs, should supply the necessary wherewithal. Surely, if fond parents can offer their sons for the service of the ministry at home and along the missionary frontiers of heathendom abroad, other parents should be willing, perhaps because they have no son to offer, or perhaps in memory of a sainted son, to consecrate enough means to make such a library possible. But a seminary needs other equipment besides a library. It needs other necessary buildings, of which I shall not now speak, to make such an institution complete. And then it needs constant support and adequate endowment for current expenses, to function. But, in connection with, and even above, all these things, it needs the prayers of the church and the unceasing guidance and blessing of the church's Head, for whose service it was founded.

Such is something of the ideal equipment of the school in which the ideal messenger of Christ must be trained. To direct and help the student to his ideal preparation, the theological seminary must be the best possible and must be put to the best possible use; and the best is not too good. Then, with an able faculty of consecrated teachers, each one, as far as that is possible, an outstanding man or an authority in his own department, and with the blessing of God upon the institution, the professors, and the students, such a theological seminary is bound to be a fountain from which shall flow forth streams that will gladden the city of our God.

A RETROSPECT AND A PROSPECT

We might today review the past history of this school of the prophets, especially that of its providential beginnings to serve this great section of the United States, toward which the center of population is fast moving. We might rehearse the self-sacrificing labors of that group of noble men to whom, under God, this seminary and the church owe a lasting debt of gratitude for making it largely what it is. We might gratefully contemplate its struggles and its triumphs. But time forbids me to make more than this passing reference to its thirty-eight years

of history. Nor is this the occasion for such a recital.

We are standing at the vanishing point between the past and the future, which for convenience we call the *present*, but which is really an ever onward-moving *nonentity*. What lies behind us in the past is fixed and could not be altered either for better or for worse. What lies before us is in a measure ours to mould and to make subservient to our purposes. As every tomorrow of the controllable future will pass into a yesterday of the irrevocable past, it is important, at least on this occasion, that we concentrate our attention upon that which still is potentially ours, upon the making of history for this institution rather than upon the reviewing of its history that is already made.

Then, while we might say, "Glories of the past, we salute you!" we trust also truthfully to be able to say, and today prefer to say, "Glories of the future, we hail you!" To make that saying true requires solid and consecrated effort. Perhaps many a mountain of difficulties will have to be ascended and crossed, but every struggle for the mastery of difficulties is worth the effort, as it strengthens us for the winning of more glorious victories. Every mountain of difficulties has lying on the other side of it its plain of solid satisfaction. Truly might we quote the conqueror's words, "Beyond the Alps lies Italy." Then "forgetting those things which are behind and reaching forth to those things which are before," let us press toward the mark that is set before us, until this seminary shall become what under God it is unmistakably meant to be.

Assured that the church, especially as represented in its synods on this and contiguous territory, will stand back of this seminary, and that in the work that lies before me I shall have her moral and material support, and assured, furthermore, of the whole-hearted encouragement and co-operation of you, its Board of Directors, and of the good will and sympathy of all who are interested in its welfare, I shall now formally accept the office of President of this institution, the Theological Seminary of the

Evangelical Lutheran Church at Chicago, Illinois, now located at Maywood, Illinois.

By my brief association with the seminary I understand some of the responsibilities that are involved in so great an undertaking, as also I already know something of the opportunities for service which this position of trust affords. As the call to this office was in direct opposition to my own wishes in the matter, I believe it to be a call through you, the Honorable Board of Directors, from God. It is the consciousness of this conviction that will hearten and strengthen me in my arduous tasks, and it will be my pleasure and joyful duty to give the best that is in me, with the help of the Great Head of the Church, to assist in making Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary that which it has all the potentialities and the right to be and what in God's own good providence it is undoubtedly meant to become. To this end I shall need the prayers and the generous undivided support of you, the Board of Directors, and the continued support of the church, which this seminary was established to serve.

Because of conditions, largely rooted in the past, the task before me is by no means an easy one. Too much must, therefore, not be expected of me at once. If one thing or another should not be done when and how some might wish, it may be due to conditions over which no one could exercise adequate control. If some things may seem for the time even to be left undone, it may be because some other things must first be done instead, as all things cannot be done at one and the same time. It shall be my aim to consider the interests of the seminary from the viewpoint of the greater whole, with an eye to the future, rather than from the viewpoint of isolated details.

Moreover, the cause shall in all things outweigh my mere personal preference, as the seminary exists for the church and the church's Lord, not for me as its president or as one of its professors. This spirit must always govern all who are associated with this institution, or with any institution of its kind; and this spirit I want all to share with me. Such a spirit is not only Lutheran in that

it makes it possible to put the most charitable construction upon one another's actions, but it is also pre-eminently Christian, in that it is seeking first the Kingdom of God. In such a spirit, all can work together, rejoicing in one another's graces and making allowance for one another's shortcomings. The ideal theological seminary must be an ideal Christian brotherhood.

My sole aim in the performance of the duties, now formally and officially delegated to me, shall be that of service, with an eye single to the glory of God, to do the right as God gives me the ability to see the right. Therefore, if the ideal will not be attained just as some might wish, I shall look for an attitude of genuine Christian charity on the part of all concerned. In the performance of my *many* and almost necessarily *successive* duties, I shall therefore ask for patience and due reservation of judgment, until the reason for any particular or apparently isolated act or policy may become apparent in the light of a future unification in the completed whole.

EFFORTS TO CHRISTIANIZE THE INDIANS OF
PENNSYLVANIA IN COLONIAL TIMES¹EARL J. BOWMAN
GETTYSBURG, PA.

I BY THE SWEDISH LUTHERANS

The earliest mission work among the Indians of Pennsylvania was done by the Swedish Lutherans along the Delaware River. Gustavus Adolphus, the King of Sweden and hero of the Thirty Years' War, had planned a settlement in America. His heroic death, Nov. 6th, 1632, prevented him from carrying out his plan. However under the reign of Queen Christiana the settlement was made. In August 1637 two vessels, the "Key of Calmer" and the "Bird Griffin" sailed from Goteborg, Sweden. After a six months' journey they landed in 1638 at a place along the Delaware which they called Paradise Point. A fort was built immediately, called Fort Christina. It stood on the present site of Wilmington, Delaware. Around this fort a settlement was built.

The year 1643 brought a new impetus to the colonial enterprise. John Printz had been appointed the Governor of New Sweden as the settlement was called. When he came, he brought with him a large number of immigrants. The first governor was Peter Minuit (Menewe) who died in 1641. Peter Hollandare acted as governor until the arrival of John Printz. Printz brought with him a series of regulations which he was instructed by Oxenstiern, ruling statesman of Sweden, to enforce. Acrelius mentions twenty-eight of these which were given at Stockholm, August 15, 1642. Instruction No. 9 dealt with the Indians. Inasmuch as it concerns our subject we shall quote it in part:

The wild nations, bordering upon all other sides, the Governor

1 From a Thesis presented to the Faculty of the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, Pa., in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Sacred Theology, April 1928.

shall understand how to treat with all humanity and respect, that no violence or wrong be done to them by Her Royal Majesty or her subjects aforesaid; but he shall rather, at every opportunity, exert himself, that the same wild people may gradually be instructed in the truths and worship of the Christian religion, and in other ways brought to civilization and good government, and in this manner properly guided. Especially shall he seek to gain their confidence, and impress upon their minds that neither he, the Governor, nor his people and subordinates are come into those parts to do them wrong or injury, but much more for the purpose of furnishing them with such things as they may need for the ordinary wants of life, and so also for such things as are found among them which they themselves cannot make for their own use, or buy or exchange. (Acrelius, *History of New Sweden*, p. 35).

Governor Printz landed at Fort Christina, February 15, 1643. With him came Rev. John Campanius who became the first Protestant missionary to the Indians. Campanius was a native of Stockholm, and at this time was about forty-two years old. His chief station was at Tinicum which was made the residence of the governor. This was an island about nine miles below Philadelphia and in what is now Delaware County. Campanius here built a small wooden church, which was dedicated Sept. 4, 1646. It continued to be used for about a half century. Here he conducted public worship on Sundays and festival days; on Wednesdays and Fridays he preached, and on all week days held morning and evening services. He was described as a man of "unwearied zeal in always propagating the love of God." He remained until May 1648 when he returned to his native land where he died Sept. 17, 1683.

We are interested especially in his work among the Indians. Along with his many duties he learned the language of the Delaware Indians so that he could tell them of the love of God. He translated Luther's Small Catechism into the speech of the Delaware Indians. When he went back to Sweden he took his work with him. It was partly printed in 1656. In that year two Swedish missionaries are said to have come to New Sweden to preach to the Indians; but trouble between Holland and Sweden frustrated their plans. It was not until 1696

that King Charles XI of Sweden at his personal expense had the work of Campanius printed. That year a long list of religious books was sent to New Sweden from the mother country. Acrelius tells us that among them were 500 copies of Luther's Catechism translated into the American language, by which he means the Indian translation of Campanius.

We hear more of Eliot's Bible than we do of Campanius' Catechism, though the latter was the earlier work. John Eliot came to Boston in 1631, and the next year settled as a teacher in Roxbury. He did not begin his work among the Indians of New England until 1646. The Indian Catechism of Campanius preceded Eliot's translation of the Bible in actual use but not in appearance in print. Eliot's New Testament was printed in 1661, while Campanius' Catechism was not printed until 1696, written copies of it being used up to that time.

The Catechism was printed in Indian and Swedish, the languages alternating. The Swedish portion is printed in Gothic or German characters, the Indian portion in Latin or English characters. It contains the entire Five parts, the Confession, the Table of Duties and Morning and Evening Prayers. There is also a vocabulary of Indian words and phrases. The book contains about 160 pages. The vocabulary contains twenty-eight pages and is entitled *Vocabularium Barbaro-virgineorum*.

The efforts to convert the Indians to Christianity put forth by the Swedes were sincere and not without results. Had disturbed political conditions not interfered they would no doubt have been crowned with success. The work of Campanius is related by his grandson, Thomas Campanius, in *A Short Description of the Province of New Sweden, now called by the English, Pennsylvania in America*:

The Indians were frequent visitors at my grandfather's house. When for the first time he performed divine service in the Swedish congregation, they came to hear him, and greatly wondered that he had so much to say, that he stood alone and talked so long, while the rest were listening in silence. This excited in them strange suspicions; they thought that everything was not right,

and that some conspiracy was going forward amongst us, in consequence of which my grandfather's life and that of the other priests were, for some time, in considerable danger from the Indians who came daily to him and asked him many questions. In those conversations, however, he gradually succeeded in making them understand that there was one Lord God (p. 75).

He then tells how Campanius explained the doctrines of Christianity after which he tells of the reaction in the Indian mind.

They had great pleasure in hearing these things, at which they greatly wondered, and began to think quite differently from what they had done before; so that he gained their affection and they visited and sent to him very frequently. This induced him to learn their language, so as to be able to translate for them what they wanted very much, to instruct them in the Christian doctrine; and he was so successful that those people who were wandering in darkness were able to see the light. He translated the Catechism into their language, and he succeeded so far that many of these barbarians were converted to the Christian faith, or at least, acquired so much knowledge of it that they were ready to exclaim as Capt. John Smith relates of the Virginia Indians, that so far as the cannons and guns of the Christians exceeded the bows and arrows of the Indians in shooting, so far was their God superior to that of the Indians (p. 75).

Just how many Indians were converted to Christianity by the work of Campanius does not seem to have been made a matter of record. In 1655 the Swedish settlements passed under the control of the Dutch who had their headquarters in New Amsterdam (New York), with the terms however that the Swedes should have freedom of worship. In 1664 the Dutch gave way to the English, who from then on controlled the Atlantic seaboard. In 1696 there was a revival of the religious work of the Swedes along the Delaware, with a renewed interest in their welfare on the part of the church in Sweden. It was then that the 500 Catechisms referred to above were brought to America, with several able Lutheran preachers. Andrew Hesselins (1713-23) was an able church organizer and religious leader in the colony. He did some work among the Indians seeking every effort to convert them. He was rewarded by being permitted to bap-

tize an Indian boy, but his convert soon lapsed again into paganism.

The efforts of the Swedish Lutherans to convert the Indians left a lasting impression upon the aborigines. One hundred years after they came to America, a treaty was made at Lancaster between Governor Thomas of the Province of Pennsylvania, Commissioners from Maryland and Virginia and about 240 representatives of the Iroquois. Conrad Weiser was the interpreter. The Indian leader was Chief Canassatego, who paid this tribute to the Swedes:

It is true that more than a hundred years ago a German (Swedish) ship came bringing many things, such as knives, hatchets, guns and the like, which they gave us, and when they had taught us the use of these things and we saw what kind of people they were, we thought so much of them that we tied their ship to the bushes upon the shore. After a while we thought the more of them the longer they staid with us; so thinking the bushes too weak we removed the rope and put it around a tree; and lest the tree might be overthrown by a storm or fall of itself, out of our great love for them, we removed the rope again and tied it to a very great rock. Still not satisfied with this, for the sake of still greater security, we removed the rope to the big mountain, where we fastened it carefully, and rolled wampum around it. And for still greater security we stood upon the wampum and sat upon it, and to prevent all injury we used all means to guard it and preserve it to the end of time. As long as this stood the newcomers from Sweden acknowledged our right to the land, and from time to time treated with us for tracts of our land, and proposed to unite and live with us as one people (Reynolds, "The Swedish Churches on the Delaware" in *Evangelical Review*, Vol. 11, p. 169).

Thus we find the foundation for William Penn's great work laid by these early settlers and their missionaries to the Indians.

II BY THE QUAKERS

There were Quakers in America previous to the coming of William Penn. His settlement of Philadelphia was made in 1682. Previous to that however a few scattered efforts to Christianize American Indians were made by Quakers. In 1659 John Taylor traveled about in America, visiting Indian villages and preaching to them.

In 1672 George Fox visited the English settlements in America and in Maryland and called upon the Indians, who received him courteously. The next year Robert Widders did some work among the Indians of Maryland and Rhode Island, also Long Island. In 1677 and 1678 John Bowater visited the Indians in New England, Maryland, Virginia, Delaware and New Jersey and was kindly received. There was, however, no Quaker settlement of any strength in America until the days of William Penn.

Penn came to America with motives of a high order. In his petition to the Crown for a charter he gave this as one of his purposes in starting Pennsylvania: "He has in view the glory of God by the civilization of the poor Indians and the conversion of the Gentiles, by just and lenient measures, to Christ's Kingdom." (Day, *North American Indians and Friends*, p. 26).

The founder of Pennsylvania like many other eminent men of his day believed firmly that the American Indians were descendants of the lost Ten Tribes of Israel. Penn gives his reasons in the following statement:

For their original I am ready to believe them of the Jewish race, I mean of the stock of the ten tribes, and that for the following reasons: first, they were to go to a land not planted or known which to be sure Asia and Africa were, if not Europe; and he that intended that extraordinary judgement upon them, might make the passage not uneasy to them, as it is not impossible in itself, from the easternmost parts of Asia to the westernmost of America. In the next place, I find them of like countenance, and their children of so lively resemblance, that a man would think himself in Duke's place or Berry St. in London, when he seeth them. But this is not all; they agree in rites, they reckon by moons; they offer their first fruits; they have a kind of feast of tabernacles; they are said to lay their altars upon twelve stones; their mourning a year, customs of women with many things that do not now occur (Day, *op. cit.*, p. 49).

Penn made a number of rules for the government of his colony. Some of these related to the Indians. Rule No. 13 said "That no man shall by any ways or means, in word or deed, affront or wrong an Indian. In a case of wrong the same penalty should apply as though it were against a fellow planter. The difficulty should be set-

tled by the governor and the king of the Indians so that all are satisfied." Another rule stipulated that all differences between the Quakers and the Indians should be settled by twelve men, six planters and six Indians. Soon after Penn landed he called a three day meeting, at which all the laws agreed upon in England and nineteen additional ones were ratified. One of these laws provided "against selling or exchanging rum, brandy or other strong drink to the Indians." The Indians had no liquor of any sort until they secured it from white men. They soon developed a taste for it. Though many Indians became drunkards, Shikellimy who for many years at Shamokin presided over much of Pennsylvania as the Iroquois viceroy, is said never to have become addicted to drink because as he said, he did not want to become a fool.

The most conspicuous event in the relation between the Quakers and the Indians was the famous treaty made at Shackamaxon. The treaty has been immortalized by Benjamin West's famous painting and by the statement of Voltaire: "This was the only treaty between these people and the Christians that was not ratified by an oath, and that was never broken." Historians differ as to the date of this famous event. It was probably June 23, 1683. Penn himself did not land in this province until Oct. 29, 1682. His deputy, William Markham, made a purchase of land in June 1682. The leading chief at Penn's treaty was Tamanend of the Unami or Turtle Clan of the Delawares. This treaty was never broken until the Penn's Creek Massacre which occurred Oct. 16, 1755.

In *North American Indians and Friends* we find quoted from Gov. Gordon of Pennsylvania the "chief heads" of the great treaty. As they have a bearing on our subject we shall reproduce them here:

1. That all of William Penn's people or Christians, and all the Indians should be brethren, as the children of one father, together as with one heart, one head and one body.

2. That all paths should be open and free to both Christians and Indians.

3. That the doors of the Christians' houses should be open to

the Indians, and the houses of the Indians open to the Christians, and that they should make each other welcome as friends.

4. That the Christians should not believe any false rumors or reports of the Indians, nor the Indians believe any such rumors or reports of the Christians, but should first come as brethren to inquire of each other; and that both Christians and Indians when they have any such false report of their brethren should bury them as in a bottomless pit.

5. That if the Christians hear any ill news that may be to the hurt of the Indians, or the Indians hear any such ill news, that may be to the injury of the Christians they should acquaint each other with it speedily, as true friends and brethren.

6. That the Indians should do no manner of harm to the Christians nor to their creatures, nor the Christians do any hurt to the Indians, but each treat the other as brethren.

7. But as there are wicked people in all nations, if either Indians or Christians should do any harm to each other, complaint should be made of it by the persons suffering, that right might be done, and when satisfaction is made, the injury or wrong should be forgot, and be buried as in a bottomless pit.

8. That the Indians should in all things assist the Christians and the Christians assist the Indians against all wicked people that would disturb them.

9. And lastly, that both Christians and Indians should acquaint their children with this league and firm chain of friendship made between them, and that it should always be made stronger and stronger, and be kept bright and clean without rust or spot between our children and our children's children, while the creeks and rivers run, and while the sun, moon and stars endure (*Day op. cit.*, pp. 32-33).

This treaty was one of several between 1681 and 1686 by which Penn purchased the entire southeastern section of the state from the Indians. Most friendly relations were developed between the Quakers and the Indians because of this fair treatment. However lazy and improvident the Red Men might be, they were faithful to their agreement with the Quakers. General William Henry Harrison from a long and intimate acquaintance with them, in war and in peace, spoke of their bravery, their generosity and fidelity to their engagements.

Other colonies suffered greatly from the Indians. In most of them the aborigines were unfairly treated and they usually retaliated with force. As long as Quaker influence predominated in Pennsylvania there was peace.

For many years the Yearly Meetings of the Quakers placed on their minutes recommendations discouraging the sale of rum to the Indians and even forbidding such transactions. These meetings also urged the maintenance of friendly relations by brotherly conduct, purchase of land, hospitable treatment and fair as well as honest conduct. James Logan who was in charge of relations with the Indians for about fifty years following Penn's visit in 1701 kept these fine ideas in force. As Scotch-Irish influence grew in the colony and these hardy pioneers pushed out to the frontier the Indian relationships became strained. The Walking Purchase of 1737 by which the colonial government defrauded the Delaware Indians of some of their land was the first striking example of the strained relationship. The Delawares under force of the Iroquois were removed from their land. They submitted, but in the French and Indian War they took a bloody revenge on the white people.

In the Albany Purchase of 1754 the colonial government bought from the Iroquois nearly all of western Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania Indians who lived on the land having nothing to do with the purchase. The French gained influence among the Indians, and after Braddock's defeat before Fort Duquesne in 1755 the Indians began a severe border warfare in Pennsylvania. Bounties were offered by the governor for Indian scalps. The Quakers opposed war. They organized "The Friendly Association for gaining and preserving Peace with the Indians by pacific measures." Through the efforts of this association peace was made in 1756, 1757 and 1758 with Teddyuscung, Chief of the Delawares. The Indians of the western part of the state were won to peace by presents to the value of about £5000. The uprising of the "Paxton Boys" disturbed the next decade. They exterminated the remnant of the Susquehanna Indians, called Conestogas, on the settlement of the latter in Lancaster County. They even threatened measures against Quakers who were friendly to Indians. The treaty of 1768 made at Fort Stanwix brought to a con-

clusion the Indian problem in colonial days in Pennsylvania.

During all these years the Quakers were active in the religious interests of the Indians. George Fox, William Penn, Thomas Turner, Thomas Story, John Richardson and Thomas Chalkley were extensively engaged in visiting the Indians and holding devotional meetings with them.

Among the most earnest Quaker missionaries to the Indians was John Woolman. Woolman lived in New Jersey where he was born 1720. He was a preacher, a social reformer and strong anti-slavery advocate. In both his own state and in Pennsylvania he exerted himself unselfishly in behalf of Christianizing the Indians. Several trips were made to various parts of Pennsylvania. In his Journal which has become a religious and devotional classic he describes his journeys. The one he made to Wehalaosing on the Susquehanna River in 1763 is the most striking.

This missionary tour as set forth in his Journal (pp. 203-230) is especially interesting. He started in May. Messengers had reached Philadelphia telling of an Indian uprising in Western Pennsylvania about Pittsburg, in which some English people were massacred. News of this Indian disturbance was carried to Mount Holly, N. J., where Woolman was at the time. In spite of the danger he set out on his proposed trip. Two friends, Israel and John Pemberton, set him on his way to the home of a friend of his in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, named Samuel Foulk. Here he was joined by four Indians—a man and three women—who were on their way back to the Wyoming Valley after transacting business in the East. These people became his guides. Here he was also joined by Benjamin Parvin, whom Woolman tried to dissuade from undertaking the journey because of the dangers it would involve.

The missionary party followed an Indian trail and spent several nights in the Blue Ridge Mountains near the Lehigh River. There were many dangers on the way.

Once he met an Indian who had a tomahawk concealed under his coat. To Woolman the weapon had a very disagreeable appearance, but he learned it was carried only for defense in case of attack. At different times other Indians were met along the way all being friendly. Woolman learned to his sorrow that certain traders were accustomed to sell rum to the Indians. His heart was also made heavy because of the carvings on the trees along the path, depicting various phases of Indian warfare. About noon, May 11, Woolman's party met a Moravian missionary and an Indian. This Moravian proved later to be David Zeisberger, who was on his way to Wehaloosing from Bethlehem on a Christian mission to the Indians. They ate together and the Moravian went on at greater speed than Woolman and reached the end of the journey first.

When Woolman arrived he was well received. At one time a group of about sixty persons met to hear him preach. He had considerable trouble with the Delaware language. He found Wehaloosing (Wyalusing) a town of about forty houses presided over by the chief, Papunhank. Woolman remained in the place assisting the Moravian missionary until June 20 when he started home, which he reached by the end of the month, having "had satisfaction in his visit."

Much as the Quakers were anxious to help the Indians religiously, and in spite of all their efforts in that direction, converts to the Quaker form of Christianity were scarce. We sum up our study of their work with this paragraph quoted from *The Quakers in the American Colonies* by Rufus M. Jones.

The Friends, beginning with George Fox and William Penn, made many attempts to convert the Indians to Christianity. At first they had large hopes of success. Their favorite teaching of the universal divine light seemed in consonance with the Indian ideas. When spoken to in this way they said that the Good Spirit in their hearts confirmed the words. But this was about as far towards Quakerism as they ever got. Indian converts were practically non-existent. The Moravians, with a definite teaching of ordinances, which appealed to the pictorial sense of the woodmen,

were more successful, and some hundreds of them, as the result of the work and influence of devoted missionaries, joined the peaceful sect, only to suffer later the horrible massacre of Gnadenhütten. The Indians respected Quaker teaching and example, but did not adopt them. Had it been possible to have kept from them the physical and moral diseases of the whites, and gradually to have influenced them towards civilization, the results might have been more happy. But the slow development of the Seneca Indians in Western New York under Quaker tutelage for a century shows in them an incapacity to accept quickly the moral and religious ideals of their teachers (p. 407).

III DAVID BRAINERD

Among the most eminent missionaries to the Indians of Pennsylvania was David Brainerd. Brainerd was born at Haddam, Connecticut, April 20, 1718. In 1739 he entered Yale College where he was distinguished for his piety and devotion to study. An indiscreet remark about one of his teachers in which Brainerd charged him as being destitute of grace as a chair, led to his expulsion in 1742. He continued his theological studies after he left college and was later licensed to preach. About that time he received an appointment from the Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge, which had been formed in 1709. About the time that Brainerd entered college prominent ministers from New York and vicinity, among whom were Rev. Jonathan Dickinson of Elizabethtown, and Rev. Aaron Burr, both of whom later became president of New Jersey College, wrote to Scotland concerning the wretched state of the Indians in New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania. The society decided to sustain two missionaries among the Indians. Brainerd received his commission Nov. 25, 1742, having been licensed to preach at Danbury, Connecticut, July 29 of the same year.

He began work among the Indians at Kaunaumeeek, a settlement in the woods about midway between Albany, N. Y., and Stockbridge, Massachusetts. He remained about a year, leaving March 14, 1744. During that time he preached and established a school for children. Reformation of a certain kind was evident, especially in drinking habits and superstitious practices.

The Kaunaumee Indians were advised to move to Stockbridge where they could be better served by another missionary, a Mr. Sergeant. Brainerd then started for the Delaware Indians, where the society under which he labored had originally proposed to send him. On the way he was met by a messenger bearing a call to become pastor of the large and wealthy church at Easthampton, Long Island. This offered a pleasant place to work, at a far more lucrative salary than the Indian work, which was attended with great privation and hardship as well as personal danger. But the offer was turned aside. He had set his face toward helping the Indians and he would not turn away from what he believed was his heaven directed work.

May 13, 1744, he arrived among the Delaware Indians at what was then called the Forks of the Delaware, where the Lehigh joins the larger stream. He spoke of the journey to this place from Fishkill on the Hudson as a trip of "about a hundred miles through a desolate and hideous country."

He worked in Pennsylvania for a little over a year. June 5, 1745, he began to preach at Crossweeksung, New Jersey. This place was about fifty miles southeast of Easton, Penna. Here he had his greatest success. His Indian interpreter, Moses Fonda Tatemy, became a Christian and proved a very valuable assistant to him. In about a year he baptized seventy-seven Indians, of whom thirty-eight were adults. His converts maintained a consistent Christian character.

In connection with this work, he also labored at Cranberry, a small settlement about fifteen miles northwest of Crossweeksung.

March 20, 1747 he held his last interview with the Delawares. A month later he left New Jersey broken in health. He went to New England to consult a physician, arriving there after traveling for about a month. He made his headquarters at Northampton, at the home of Jonathan Edwards, where he died October 9, 1747.

Brainerd had only four years of life to give to mission

work among the Indians. But the influence of his brief life goes marching on. It was the reading of the brave and holy life of Brainerd that sent Henry Martyn to the Moslem world. His career had much to do also with turning William Carey toward India. Carey in turn influenced Adoniram Judson to go to Burma. These in late days have moved the hearts of many missionaries toward the unevangelized people of the world. Among missionaries there are few who in so short a time have exerted so far reaching an influence as Brainerd.

But we are interested particularly in his work among the Indians in Pennsylvania. On the way to the Forks of the Delaware, about twelve miles North of Easton, Pa., he came to a small settlement of Dutch and Irish people. He ministered also to them. The summer of 1744 he spent riding to the various Indian settlements in the vicinity, preaching every Lord's Day several times, translating prayers for the Indians, using every opportunity to bring them to Christ. His journal for these days is filled with an account of the difficulties he encountered because of the scattered settlement of the Delawares, the inability of his interpreter, the limitations of his physical health, his fatal disease then already making it impossible to work for days at a time. His journal also contains lengthy statements of his anguish of soul because of the pagan practices he observed and the fervency of his prayers that God might win for himself a name among these wretched people. He was present Sunday, May 27, at a heathen funeral which caused him great sorrow. After it was over he succeeded in getting the Indians together and preaching a sermon on Hebrews 2:3. During this time he was subject to many periods of doubt and melancholy. June 25, he recorded these words in his diary:—"To an eye of reason every thing respects the conversion of the Heathen is as dark as midnight."

The next day he wrote:

In prayer my soul was enlarged, and my faith drawn into sensible exercise; was enabled to cry to God for my poor Indians; and though the work of their conversion appeared impossible with men,

yet with God I saw all things were possible. It seemed to me, that there could be no impediment sufficient to obstruct that glorious work, seeing the living God, as I strongly hoped, was engaged in it. (*Memoirs of the Rev. David Brainerd*, p. 150).

At another time he was so discouraged by his heathen environment that he recorded a doubt whether there could be a God. Such lapses and rises of hope are frequently read as one peruses his interesting journal.

Monday, May 28, he started for Newark, which he reached on Tuesday. The occasion of this visit was the meeting of the Presbytery at that place. This body ordained him June 12. June 19 he set out again for the Forks of the Delaware, which he reached after three days' travel.

In September he was absent from his work for about three weeks, having made a journey of about four hundred and twenty miles on horseback to New England and back again.

October 2 he set out from home for the Susquehanna River, accompanied by Rev. Byram, who lived at Rockciticus about forty miles from Brainerd's home, and by an interpreter and two Indians. They traveled through country which Brainerd describes as "nothing but a hideous and howling wilderness," offering no shelter or protection. On October 5 they reached the Susquehanna River at a place called Opeholhaupung where there were twelve Indian houses, in which lived about seventy souls. He preached a number of times to these Indians who received him with courtesy and attention. October 9 they started home. He reached his lodging October 12. His journal of October 9 says they started at five in the morning and traveled until six in the evening when they built a fire and a bark shelter for the night. He says: "In the night the wolves howled around us; but God preserved us."

Under date of Nov. 5, 1744 Brainerd wrote a letter from the Forks of the Delaware to Rev. Ebenezer Pemberton who lived in New York, in which letter he gave a lengthy account of his work. We shall refer to that part

of it only which dealt with his work in Pennsylvania. The Indian town at the Forks of the Delaware was called Sak-hauwotung and was located within the Forks. It was a small town of about ten houses, most of the Indians having removed farther to the interior. Some of these houses in the settlement were several miles distant from the others. When he first began to preach he had from twenty to twenty-five hearers, but near the close of the summer the number increased to forty. He observed some success in his work among them. In July he began to preach in a town called Kauksesauchung located about thirty miles westward and having about thirty people. After two visits to them, these Indians moved to the Susquehanna River.

He states that he was well received wherever he went, though at one place a few suspected him of ill designs, because other white people abused the Indians and robbed them of their lands. Some Indians feared they should be made slaves, be carried to Europe and be made to fight for the English against the Spanish and French.

In this letter Brainerd mentions the difficulties which he encountered in his work. They were chiefly:—prejudice against white people because of the vicious and unchristian lives of some who claimed to be Christians; the strong attachment the natives had for the customs of their fathers; their superstitions; their roving manner of living and the difficulty of their language.

One or two paragraphs from the letter throw much light on the problems of his work:

Again, these poor Heathen are extremely attached to the customs, traditions and fabulous notions of their fathers. And this one seems to be the foundation of all their other notions, viz: that, 'it was not the same God made them, who made the white people,' but another who commanded them to live by hunting, &c., and not to conform to the customs of the white people.—Hence, when they are desired to become Christians, they frequently reply that: 'they will live as their fathers lived and go to their fathers when they die.' And if the miracles of Christ and his apostles be mentioned, to prove the truth of Christianity, they also mention sundry miracles, which their fathers have told them were anciently wrought among the Indians, and which Satan makes them believe were so.—

They are much attached to idolatry; frequently making feasts, which they eat in honor of some unknown beings, who they suppose, speak to them in dreams; promising them success in hunting, and other affairs, in case they will sacrifice to them. They oftentimes also offer their sacrifices to the spirits of the dead; who, they suppose, stand in need of favours from the living, and yet are in such a state as that they can well reward all the offices of kindness that are shown them. And they impute all their calamities to the neglect of these sacrifices.

Furthermore, they are much awed by those among themselves, who are called *pow-wows*, who are supposed to have a power of enchanting or poisoning them to death, or at least in a very distressing manner. And they apprehended it would be their sad fate to be thus enchanted in case they should become Christian. (*Memoirs*, p. 178).

March 7, 1745, he made a journey of about five weeks' duration to New England, visiting parts of New Jersey, New York and Connecticut, seeking to secure funds so as to provide a colleague for his work. He had now spent two years in the wilderness in a solitary fashion and he was very anxious for help. The journey covered about six hundred miles and was made on horseback. The week of April 14 he went to Philadelphia to engage the interest of the Colonial Governor that he might have permission to remove to the Susquehanna to instruct the Indians who lived along that stream on the land claimed by the Six Nations. In a week he was back again at the Forks of the Delaware.

May 8 he set out again for the Susquehanna River. The journey was attended with great hardship. The party was overtaken with a northeasterly storm in which there was danger of perishing, the horses became sick, and Brainerd himself suffered so much from the exposure that he had to lodge for a week without medicine or proper food in an Indian hut, before he could return home. On this journey he traveled along the river about one hundred miles, found seven or eight Indian tribes and visited many settlements and towns. He was much encouraged because of the manner in which he was received. He met some of his former hearers from Kautawmeek who had removed thither. He returned home

from an island far down the river which he called Jun-cauta, where he found a considerable number of Indians, rather free from prejudice against Christianity. He arrived at the Forks of the Delaware May 30, having covered three hundred and forty miles.

In June 1745 Brainerd moved to Crossweeksung. The last two weeks of July he was back again at the Forks of the Delaware. He then resumed his work in New Jersey and early in September he set out for the Forks of the Delaware once more, intending to go on to the Susquehanna. He left the Forks Sept. 9 and after a four days' journey arrived at Shaumoking (Shamokin), now Sunbury, one hundred and twenty miles westward from the junction of the Lehigh and the Delaware. He speaks of having visited this town in May 1744. He was kindly received and entertained by the natives, but saw little success. Under date of Sept. 13 his journal contains this statement of his impression of the place:

I had little satisfaction by reason of the heathenish dance and revel they then held in the house where I was obliged to lodge; which I could not suppress, though I often entreated them to desist, for the sake of one of their own friends who was then sick in the house, and whose disorder was much aggravated by the noise. Alas! how destitute of natural affection are these poor, uncultivated Pagans! although they seem somewhat kind in their own way. Of a truth the dark corners of the earth are full of the habitations of cruelty. This town, as I observed in my Diary of May last, lies partly on the East side of the river, partly on the West, and partly on a large island in it; and contains upwards of fifty houses and nearly three hundred persons, though I never saw much more than half that number in it. They are of three different tribes of Indians, speaking three languages wholly unintelligible to each other. About one half of its inhabitants are Delawares; the others called Senakas and Tutelos. The Indians of this place, are accounted the most drunken, mischievous and ruffian like fellows of any of these parts; and satan seems to have his seat in this town in an eminent manner (*Memoirs*, pp. 232-3).

Brainerd remained at Shamokin preaching to the Indians in groups and visiting from house to house until noon Sept. 17, when, because most of the Indians were leaving on a hunting expedition he traveled down the river. The

next day he stopped at a large island where was an Indian town called Juncauta. He was much discouraged by his reception there. Many of the natives were sick and they were holding pow-wows to discover the cause of the illness. He describes their wild contortions. Many of them could understand English fairly well, having come from Maryland where they lived near English people. From the reference he makes to their strange burial customs they must have been Nanticoke Indians. These Indians at this time had a settlement near the mouth of the Juniata River.

Under date of Sept. 20 his journal contains this entry :

Visited the Indians again at Juncauta Island, and found them almost universally very busy in making preparation for a great sacrifice and dance. Had no opportunity to get them together, in order to discourse with them about Christianity, by reason of their being so much engaged about their sacrifice....

In the evening they met together, nearly a hundred of them, and danced around a large fire, having prepared ten fat deer for the sacrifice. The fat of the inwards they burnt in the fire while they were dancing, and sometimes raised the flame to a prodigious height; at the same time yelling and shouting in such a manner, that they might easily have been heard two miles or more. They continued their sacred dance nearly all night, after which they ate the flesh of the sacrifice, and so retired each one to his own lodging.

I enjoyed little satisfaction; being entirely alone on the island as to any Christian company, and in the midst of this idolatrous revel; and having walked to and fro till body and mind were pained and much oppressed, I at length crept into a little crib made for corn and there slept on the poles (*Memoirs*, p. 235).

The next day was the Lord's Day and Brainerd describes it as the most burdensome and disagreeable Sabbath he had ever seen. He spoke of the Indians all along the Susquehanna River as in such a deplorable spiritual state that there could be no doubt they were led captive to the will of Satan in the most eminent manner. These Indians on the island were so near white settlements that they could easily secure liquor. He continued to labor among them until September 23, when he left Juncauta for the Forks of the Delaware and Crossweeksung, which

latter place he reached Saturday, October 5. The last two weeks of February 1746 he spent in Pennsylvania at the Forks of the Delaware.

August 12, 1746, he set out on his last journey to the Susquehanna River. He planned to go via Philadelphia then westward and strike the river on its lower course where it was settled by white people, and then travel up the stream, thus avoiding some of the mountains and much of the wilderness. By August 19 he reached the river at Paxton, then went up stream and four days later arrived at Shaumoking. The rest of August he spent in and about that settlement, laboring with the Indians with more encouragement than on any previous visit to that place. His physical condition was gradually growing worse. Tuberculosis was causing heavy night sweats and forcing him to spit blood. He tells of lodging in an Indian hut, where the smoke was so thick he could not endure it without great pain in his head and neck, and of an atmosphere so raw outdoors that he could scarcely survive. September 1, he and a few others set out to go up the West Branch of the Susquehanna to Great Island where Lock Haven now is. This meant a trip as he said of about fifty miles from Shaumoking.

September 2, he writes:

I was so feeble and faint, that I feared it would kill me to lie out in the open air; and some of our company being parted from us, so that we had now no axe with us, I had no way but to climb into a young pine tree and with my knife to lop the branches and so made a shelter from the dew. But the evening being cloudy, and very likely for rain, I was still under fears of being extremely exposed; sweat much in the night, so that my linen was almost wringing wet all night. I scarcely ever was more weak and weary, than this evening, when I was able to sit up at all (*Memoirs*, p. 379).

Arriving at Great Island the next day he visited a town of Delawares but found many of them drinking and already drunken. He also visited a settlement of Shawnees about eight miles away, but got no encouragement, and a day later started back for Shaumoking. That night he slept at the same place he did the night of Sept. 1, and

was alone until past ten o'clock, without any fire to cook supper, or keep him warm or to ward off wild beasts. He reached Shaumoking the evening of the fifth of September, where he remained until the eighth of September when he went down the river for home. It had been his plan to spend considerable time among the Indian villages along the Susquehanna, but because of his physical condition he hastened toward home as fast as his strength permitted. He arrived among his people at Cranberry, New Jersey, September 20. This was the last work Brainerd did in Pennsylvania.

His missionary efforts were marked with an intensity and fervency of prayer seldom surpassed, with a clear proclamation of evangelical truth, and with the catechetical method of instruction, which had to be simplified to fit the ability of the Indian mind. He travelled as much as four thousand miles a year, which was a task of great hardship in that day. No man could have prosecuted his work more earnestly; yet as far as numbers were concerned his efforts in Pennsylvania were not crowned with great success.

GERMAN MISSIONS IN INDIA DURING THE WAR

JOHN ABERLY
GETTYSBURG, PA.

The tenth anniversary of the signing of the Armistice has called forth not a small amount of literature on the War. Books are being written on the causes that led up to the world conflagration. It is not our purpose to join in any of these discussions. Our purpose is rather to put into some permanent form certain facts regarding German missions in India which, it seems to us, ought to be preserved for the future church and mission historian. The facts are gleaned largely from private diaries and personal recollections. We would not leave the reader under the impression that we offer a full account of everything that happened to the missions during that period of time. There were no doubt currents and cross currents affecting the missions about which those who were in India were in large part ignorant. It is, however, no less true that we were in touch with other currents of which we alone were first-hand witnesses. It is to present these to the reader, as well as to preserve them for the future historian who ought to have all the facts from all sides, that this article is written.

The Lutheran missions in India that were affected by the War were the Leipzig Mission in the Tamil area in Madras and vicinity especially southwards, the Hermannsburg Mission in the Vellore and adjacent districts, from fifty to a hundred miles north and northwest of Madras, the Schleswig-Holstein Mission towards the extreme north of the Madras Presidency, and the Gossner Mission about two hundred miles west of Calcutta. All these missions, it will be noticed, are in the area that is under the Government of Madras except the Gossner which is in Bihar and Orissa. For reasons that will appear, we shall treat of these missions according to provincial areas and not according to missions.

MISSIONS IN THE MADRAS PRESIDENCY

These missions need to be considered separately, for they were in close proximity to other Lutheran missions. The Church of Sweden worked with the Leipzig Mission even though each had its own field; the Hermannsburg Mission worked with the joint Synod of Ohio so intimately that the trouble here was to make clear to the authorities that they were separate mission organizations; the Rajahmundry Mission of the General Council had from the time of the beginning of the Schleswig-Holstein Mission acted as a kind of an elder brother to it. Had the Lutheran church in India had some united organization, the work here could have carried on without much of a change in administration just as German and Austrian Roman Catholic missions were continued in different parts of India. As Lutheran missions have had and continue to have separate administrative and ecclesiastical organizations, other ways had to be found for the continuance of the work of these missions.

In noting the steps that had to be taken, to make such provision, it is gratifying to recall the fine Christian spirit that animated one and all. It was on August tenth that we were present at a meeting of the Madras Missionary Conference composed of all missionaries working in and around Madras. Members of German missions were present at that meeting just as before hostilities commenced. The subject for discussion was *The Ecclesiastical Position of the Lutheran Church*. Even this subject was discussed without any prejudice against Lutherans. British missionaries at that time privately encouraged us American Lutherans to do all that we could to assist German missions. This was the attitude not only of the missionary body but also of the secular press. A week later a petition was made to the Madras Government to be permitted to make an appeal for funds to help distressed missions and the request was immediately granted.

This same sympathetic attitude on the part of the Madras Government was shown on another occasion. The

Rev. G. N. Thomssen of the American Baptist Mission, himself of German birth, had arranged for the heads of the various German missions to have an interview with the Governor of Madras, Lord Pentland. The official heads of the Basel, Leipzig, Hermannsburg and Schleswig-Holstein Missions, along with Rev. G. N. Thomssen and the writer, were received most cordially and sympathetically by the Governor. He assured those missions how deeply he felt for them in the plight into which the War had plunged them and assured them that all that could be done for the conservation of their good work would be done. Pursuant to this meeting, a committee consisting of the Rev. W. E. H. Organe, secretary of the British and Foreign Bible Society, the Rev. G. N. Thomssen, the Rev. E. Neudoerffer and the writer was formed to receive and disburse monies for the relief of German missions. This committee received and disbursed about Rupees One Hundred Thousand during the War. One of the most appreciated contributions came from the Church Missionary Society in Great Britain and another contribution was received through the American Board. An appeal was made shortly after this by the Madras Representative Council of Missions for funds to relieve any personal distress among German missionaries. British and American missionaries contributed as long as the need existed and turned over their subscriptions to the above mentioned committee.¹ Whenever the statement is seen that Christianity has failed, the mind of the writer turns to those scenes of real sacrifice made not in order to help friends but those who for the time being were in a hostile camp. And this spirit, it is gratifying to record, characterized the great bulk of the missionaries all through the war.

It was not long, however, before it became clear that, if for no other reason than for their own protection, Ger-

1 The writer regrets that the documents pertaining to this and other matters have been destroyed in the changes incident to changes in mission work. This may emphasize the urgency that the facts be gathered from such private records as are yet available.

man missionaries would have to be removed from their fields of work. A few of the younger missionaries were under oath to join the German colors and they, as a matter of course, had already been interned as soon as hostilities had broken out. It is only to be expected that among the large number of other missionaries there would always be some who could not refrain from championing the cause of their own country, especially when they felt it was maligned, and so there were indiscretions among them in word, though not in deed, that justified the authorities in altering their more liberal policy and removing them from their mission stations. The remarkable fact is though, not that there were some indiscretions, but that under those difficult circumstances there should have been so few.

It was towards the end of November, nearly four months after the outbreak of the War, that a general order came that all the missionaries of the Schleswig-Holstein Mission received orders that they were to remove from their stations; the Hermannsburg missionaries received similar orders very shortly after this. There were special reasons for these orders. The former mission operated in an agency tract that is more undeveloped. There had been restlessness among the people there, due to other causes, but it was natural that suspicion for it should fall on the aliens in their midst. The latter mission suffered because of the over-enthusiasm of an ex-missionary of theirs who, though not in India, yet felt called on to advise an Indian of influence, by letter, that this was the opportunity for India to strike for her liberties. Even after this time, when the War was now well on in its fifth month, the Government, through the Representative Council of Missions, addressed the various British and neutral missions to see whether they could receive the German missionaries of the Basel Mission as guests in their homes so as to make internment in some concentration camp in Madras unnecessary. As late as December 11, the Guntur missionaries had a meeting to consider the question and decided that they would be prepared to offer them, as far as they were able, such hospitality.

In a neighboring mission, a missionary had actually received such a guest and had even given him work in an industrial settlement while such arrangements were still under consideration. The plan, however, was never put into operation. The Leipzig missionaries, on the other hand, under certain restrictions, were still permitted to continue in their work. They were allowed to do so if two British citizens would stand sponsor for them. It was a real compliment to the confidence that they had gained in one district, that of Tanjore, that the chief magistrate of that district was ready to assume such responsibility for all who were laboring under his jurisdiction. This arrangement, however, also was terminated as the War continued.

The removal of missionaries from their work, at first of some missions and finally of all, created a problem. The fact is there were now two problems facing us, one that of the support of the missions and the other that of their administration. The latter was the more acute one, for the time being. It was at this time that Mr. E. C. Carter, national secretary of the Y. M. C. A. in India, returned to India after a furlough in America and he came with a special request from mission leaders in Great Britain and in America to do something that would provide for the continuance of the work of these missions. The Y. M. C. A. had a peculiar advantage in taking the initiative because through its army branch it was rendering such marked service that they were given contacts with the highest authorities, civil and military. Mr. Carter arranged for a meeting of representative British church and mission leaders at Madras on January 4, 1915, at the home of the Bishop of Madras. That the committee was representative may be seen from the fact that two Anglicans, two Scotch Presbyterians, one British Congregationalist and one Wesleyan were present from among the various missions, besides the Bishop of Madras. At Mr. Carter's special request, the writer was also permitted to be present. It was at this meeting that the suggestion was adopted that a committee of British missionaries make themselves responsible before Government

for the carrying on of the missions, and especially the school work of the missions. After approval of this had been secured from the Government, this committee became the German Missions Committee of the Madras Representative Council of Missions and, later, was made the German Missions Committee of the National Missionary Council of India. The committee did not directly carry on the work of the German missions but it suggested arrangements and stood sponsor before Government for those who were put in charge of the missions. It was thus that they secured permission of Government for certain missionaries of the Church of Sweden Mission to look after Leipzig, for General Council missionaries to look after Schleswig-Holstein, for Guntur missionaries to look after Hermannsburg, and for London Mission and Wesleyan missionaries to look after Basel. School grants were then continued by Government under this arrangement as before the war. The work of the German Missions Committee was no light one. Because of support secured through Mr. J. H. Oldham, and the courtesy of the Wesleyan Missionary Society, the Rev. D. G. M. Leith, a Wesleyan missionary at Madras, was secured to give his entire time to the work of secretary of this committee. Because of the splendid service he rendered, while it would be too much to claim that the work of German missions went on as before, it can yet be safely asserted that it went on with a minimum of dislocation. The British churchmen and missionaries showed a spirit of service that ought to go far to correct the statement, often heard, that the war showed Christianity's failure. It also showed the real vital power of Christianity if one but look at the place where the Christian spirit was allowed room for expression.

The matter of property yet calls for special mention. As soon as the German Missions Committee began to function, it became the agent for the management of mission properties under the officer of Government known as the Custodian of Enemy Properties. They were so managed until the Peace Treaty made specific arrangements about them. To this reference will be made later.

Reference however ought to be made to the large Industrials of the Basel Mission. These were really only indirectly mission property. A subsidiary company, an adjunct to the mission, financed these as a business proposition though it must be observed that they paid all dividends over and above a reasonable interest on their investments to the mission itself. These industries were declared to be on the same footing as other business concerns and were sold. While this does not come within the purview of this article, it ought yet to be mentioned that under the guidance of Mr. J. H. Oldham the British Commonwealth Trust Company was organized and took over these Industrials along lines similar to those along which they had been operated before.

THE GOSSNER MISSION OF BIHAR AND ORISSA

The Lutheran Church in America has heard more about the Gossner Mission as, through the National Lutheran Council, this mission has been supported through its efforts almost entirely for the last ten years. It ought to be noted, however, that that support commenced only after the War was over and the Armistice had been signed. Here our purpose is rather to recall the steps that led up to this arrangement after the War.

It ought to be mentioned that the Gossner Mission's problems were entirely different from those of the missions of South India. American Lutherans do not operate in the North of India. The only Lutherans that the authorities there were acquainted with were German Lutherans. The Gossner Mission, it is true, had been represented at the All-India Lutheran Conferences in Guntur in 1908 and again in 1913 at Rajahmundry. But distance and also, it must be admitted, our Lutheran cleavages, had hindered their entering into the purpose of the conference with any enthusiasm. Had there been more of the cultivation of a consciousness of Lutheran unity before the War and had the authorities of the mission then asked Government for permission to hand over the work to some Lutheran missionary of some neutral nationality, the history of this mission might have been dif-

ferent during the period of the War. But it is not our purpose to dwell on what might have been but to chronicle what course events actually did take.

It ought to be mentioned then that Chota Nagpur, where the Gossner Mission operates, is inhabited by more independent hill people who have a grievance not because of what the British Government did to them but because the Government had refused to redress a wrong that had been done them before it was established among them. Here even an outsider can see that there was reason for a cautious policy. Before missionaries were removed in the South, the more than 100,000 Christians of the Gossner Mission were left without their spiritual shepherds. Before the removal of the missionaries, the Rev. Mr. Stosch, the Director of the mission, arranged with the Anglican Bishop of Chota Nagpur, then the Rt. Rev. Foss Westcott, a son of the famous textual critic of the New Testament, to supervise the work during the continuance of the War.

The immediate benefits of such an arrangement must be admitted. It gave to the mission from the very outset, what it took a long time to secure in South India, an agency for the supervision of the work that had the full confidence of Government. So favorably did this operate that Government not only gave the usual half grant to the schools of the mission during the War, and even for some time after this, but assumed their entire cost. By putting the Indian pastors and catechists on half salary, this large mission could thus be financed during the war at a cost of only \$600 a month. Then the Bishop could and did make an appeal to the British public to furnish even this small amount before our more slowly moving Lutheran machinery could be set in operation to secure and furnish the funds. This it did from the end of 1916 onwards, first through the General Synod Board of Foreign Missions and later through the National Lutheran Council. Then, too, the Bishop could do for the mission, what those of the South could not have done for it, furnish a few missionaries, to the number of four or five, who knew the language of the people and so could more

efficiently supervise the work. One fails to see how the work could have been carried on as it was but for the self-sacrificing service of the Bishop of Chota Nagpur, who is now the revered Metropolitan of India, and his able assistants.

While the advantages were such that they must always be gratefully recognized, it must yet be evident to any one who considers the matter that it created a situation that had in it the possibility of altering the entire ecclesiastical complexion of the mission. There are those who so deplore denominational differences that they would consider this a real gain to the church as a whole. We need not be surprised that to such the situation seemed a peculiar providence which could be made to serve the interests of union. The writer is persuaded that those who so interpreted the situation were sincere in their view. The Bishop of Chota Nagpur had promised the Director of the mission not to do anything to alter the ecclesiastical character of the mission during the war, and this promise he faithfully kept. At the same time the logic of events seemed for a time to point to some such union arrangement as the only possible way to conserve the work. Attention is called to the steps that enabled the Gossner church to carry on as an integral part of the Lutheran church in India; more than that, that made it possible for that church, under the stress of circumstances, to point the way that all missions must go in making the church and not the foreign organization, known as the mission, the center of Christian work in the established mission fields of India and of the world.

Such a goal did not enter into our thoughts at first. Our efforts in India were directed rather towards some Lutheran oversight of the work. Those of us who worked towards that end had in mind the taking over of that mission by some other Lutheran society. At the meeting of the National Missionary Council, in November, 1915, already, the writer had an interview with the Bishop and asked him for permission to have some one of us Southern Lutherans visit the Gossner Christians and show them that their fellow Lutherans of other parts

sympathized with them and were ready to be of service to them. His reply was—and it may have been the only one possible under the circumstances—that as he was managing the work only at the request of the Gossner Mission Director, it was for them and not for him to decide whether efforts were to be made to move Government to allow such a visitation.

It was to consider this and other matters that representatives of the General Council Mission at Rajahmundry, the Ohio Mission, the Danish Mission, the Church of Sweden Mission, and the General Synod Mission of Guntur met at Guntur December 18, 1915. Its main work was to draft a letter to German mission boards asking them to make formal requests to Lutheran missions to look after their work. While it was addressed to German mission boards in general, it really only applied to the Gossner board, for the others had already made arrangements such as we were suggesting. The letter went so far as to point out to the Gossner board that the arrangements made by their Director would, if continued for a long time, as the War then promised to make them, most naturally lead the Christians to look to others for guidance and support, and this would almost inevitably lead to their being alienated from the Lutheran church. This letter reached them through regularly authorized channels. A reply came in due time which, however, instead of meeting our request, confirmed the arrangement that had been made for mission by the Director. It pointed out that the Bishop had promised to make no change in the mission during the war and that they did not desire that any change should be made now but added, that in case it should become clear that the German missionaries would not be permitted to return to the work, then they would do all in their power to make such arrangements that the Lutheran character of the work should be conserved. Practically this meant that we were to keep hands off during the War and our only way of helping the mission was by contributing to its financial needs. These needs were becoming more and more acute for, while the monthly requirements of \$600 were small, the National

Missionary Council, which by this time had through its Committee on German Missions made itself responsible for the work of the Mission, had to look to the Lutherans of America to furnish this amount. Among ourselves we had agreed that as the General Council was helping the Schleswig-Holstein Mission, the General Synod should be responsible to meet the needs of the Gossner field. This the General Board did for several years, though not without some misgivings that we were only sowing what others would reap in the end.

Thus things went on for another two years until the meeting of the National Missionary Council at Coonoor, November 9-14, 1917. The Report on German Missions came very late in that session of the council. The reaction of the writer to the report may be seen from a quotation taken from his diary written at the time: "It looks very much as though the Gossner Mission would indirectly at least remain under Anglican control, if not soon directly." The reason for this was a statement by the Anglican Bishop to the effect that, when the arrangements for the mission had been made with him, everybody expected that the War would be a short one; it had however dragged on and it was becoming evident that some more permanent arrangements had to be made; two things now seemed clear, that German missionaries would not be allowed to return to their work for a long time to come and that Government was not disposed to allow any non-British mission to take over their field; he therefore asked Council whether he might place these facts before the Gossner Christians and suggest to them that the way out might be a united church which should be neither Anglican nor Lutheran but which should be Indian. It was too late in the session to discuss the suggestion at any length. No action was asked for from Council but it was suggested that the Bishop and the writer consult together about it. To show how hurriedly we consulted together, it need only be mentioned that our conversation was confined to the short time we had together at a railroad junction while waiting for a train. The way was opened however for correspondence on the subject and that was both more lengthy and deliberate.

Nor did it stop there. The writer mentioned to Indian leaders at the conference that, if non-British societies were to be excluded from working in Chota Nagpur, why should not the Lutheran section of the National Missionary Society, a purely Indian association, ask that it be permitted to look after the work? Leaders in that society, notably Mr. J. D. Asirvadam who visited America in 1924, were deeply interested in seeking for some such arrangement. So were Indian leaders of other churches. The awakening of Indian Nationalism no doubt made the suggestion appeal to them in a special way. They moved in the matter but were informed that Government did not consider that the society was able to administer the large property interests of the mission nor could they recognize them as responsible managers of the large school work which the carrying on of the mission would require them to undertake. Thus this proposal was checkmated; for it would have been out of the question for the Indian Lutherans to think of carrying on the work unless they could use the mission's property and also be assured of school Grants from Government. The proposal however did one thing indirectly that shaped events from this time onwards. It brought Indian Lutherans of the South into contact with leaders in the Gossner Mission. It is pathetic, and once again ought to bring home to us the sin of our Lutheran divisions, that up to that time the Gossner Christians did not know that there were other Lutherans in India that were interested in them. It put new hopes into them when they learned of American and other Lutherans in Southern India. Why should we still continue to think of our own mission or section of the church instead of thinking of the church as a whole?

The final stage in the arrangements for the Gossner Mission began with the meeting of the National Missionary Council in Benares, November 13-18, 1918. News of the signing of the Armistice had just been received. No definite plan had yet been evolved for the continuance of the work of the mission. The Anglican Bishop who had carried the responsibility for the work for over four

years naturally urged that some permanent arrangements be made. It was also evident that according to his judgment the only arrangement that seemed feasible under the circumstances was that of forming a united Church of Chota Nagpur which should be neither Anglican nor Lutheran but Indian. The writer opposed this vigorously but when called on in conference over the matter to suggest some other plan could only promise to refer the matter to the Lutherans in America. The Anglican Bishop kindly offered to give the writer a letter of introduction to the Governor of Bihar and Orissa to ascertain Government's attitude towards some non-British Lutheran mission's taking charge of the work. It was felt however that until there would be something definite to propose such an interview would be useless. The Anglican Bishop of Assam sounded what now became the guiding principle in the solution, and that was that the day is past when any people can be transferred from one nation to another or from one ecclesiastical body to another without their own consent. The whole matter was then referred to the Executive Committee of the National Missionary Council with the tacit understanding that the wishes of the Gossner Christians themselves were to be ascertained and that these should be the determining factor in the solution. In the meantime it devolved on our Lutheran missionaries to suggest some feasible plan for the support of the mission, should it continue its Lutheran character.

It was under these circumstances that, after consultation with the Augustana members of the General Council's mission at Rajahmundry, a cablegram was sent to the Augustana Mission Board asking them whether they would assume responsibility for the work. We did not know then in India that the National Lutheran Council stood ready to assist just in emergencies of this kind. The arrangement ultimately worked out was that the National Lutheran Council made itself responsible for the support of the mission. One wonders what could have been done had not this council been ready for immediate action. This reduced the problem to that of working out

a plan in India that would be acceptable to Government, and that had to be worked out by joint mission workers in India.

The writer left India on furlough before these plans could be worked out. The Rev. I. Cannaday and the Rev. O. L. Larson met with the Executive Committee of the National Missionary Council in March, 1919. At that time a commission was appointed to ascertain the wishes of the Christians of the Gossner Mission. Their report, and final action that would be called for by the report, was not made to the National Missionary Council but to the Provincial Council of Bihar and Orissa, one of the constituent bodies of the National Missionary Council that operated in that part of India. The commission received such an unequivocal desire of the Gossner Christians to continue as a Lutheran church, preferably under some American mission board, but, should that not be feasible, then as an autonomous church, that the Provincial Council's work was marked out for it, namely, to work and to propose some plan that would be acceptable to Government whereby the Lutheran character of the work could be conserved. The Rev. A. G. Rupley met with this Provincial Council later, when plans were perfected whereby the church was recognized as an autonomous church but an advisory committee of the Provincial Council was constituted to advise with the autonomous church and particularly to be responsible for the school work towards which Government made generous grants. This plan was acceptable to Government. The Advisory Committee was composed largely of British missionaries but the secretary has always been one of the United Lutheran Church's missionaries, first the Rev. A. G. Rupley and then the Rev. I. Cannaday, who was the permanent secretary until the work of the Advisory Committee ceased only last year. The reason for its concluding its work is that the German missionaries have again been permitted to return to the work, though no longer as controlling the church but as workers in and with the church. With this the arrangements for the mission that had to be made because of the War came to a close.

In reviewing the steps in this account, one cannot but be impressed with the Providence that not only brought the need of a great work and the supply for that need together, but also overruled, what looked as if it might be calamitous for the mission, so that it worked out for its larger good. The National Lutheran Council and our United Lutheran Church, we believe, have rendered no more signal service anywhere than that of tiding over the work of this mission during these trying years. But whatever work Americans did, whether at the home base or in India, this brief account of German missions during the war will have failed to give the impression that it is intended to give if it does not show the invaluable services rendered to the mission by British churchmen and missionary leaders. No one dreamed at the beginning or during the continuance of the War that the Missions would suffer as little as they have done because of such a prolonged struggle. Let our church never fail to recognize that they did suffer so little because of the service rendered by British church and missionary leaders both in Great Britain and in India.

Reference ought yet to be made to the adjustments about mission properties. For a time rumors of confiscation of mission property were in the air. Having had occasion to consult with government authorities at different times, the writer is convinced the rumors were baseless. The care of the mission property during the War went with the temporary arrangements for the administration of the missions themselves. In the Peace Treaty of Versailles these properties were separately dealt with in Article 438. The properties were thereby made over to the Allied and Associated Powers. On the other hand these powers obligated themselves to devote these to the use of the missions, and to carry out this purpose obligated themselves to hand them over to "boards of trustees appointed by or approved by the Governments and composed of persons holding the faith of the mission whose property is involved." The Government in India regards such trusteeship as so sacred that there would be no loss to the missions if the arrangement should be made

a permanent one. This however will not be the case. It is recognized that such trusteeship will be only temporary and that the missions themselves will be put in trust with all their properties. It ought to give the friends of missions renewed confidence in making investments in the great missionary enterprise when they see this new precedent set in the greatest international recognition that missions have ever received in the counsels of the nations. We have read of injustices done in the smaller countries of Europe in the alienation of properties from their right-ecclesiastical owners. With much larger opportunity to perpetrate such an injustice in India and other mission fields, it is a matter that speaks well for the high sense of honor of statesmen the world over that such injustice can not be perpetrated in mission lands. The few properties that were confiscated were all private properties. Even private properties that had been secured for mission purposes have been generously returned. The mission properties were all sacredly preserved and are now used for mission work. Some of these properties were very valuable as for instance the one hundred acre mission compound in Ranchi right in the heart of that beautiful summer capital of Bihar and Orissa. One can not review this history without feeling that there is a kingdom not of this world which transcends national boundaries—even national alienations. No finer illustration of this could be given than this that centres around the conservation of German Lutheran Mission work in India.

THE PRACTICAL POSSIBILITIES OF LUTHER'S SMALL CATECHISM

PAUL J. HOH
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

The Four-hundredth Anniversary of Luther's Small Catechism brings vividly to mind the history and the unprecedented influence of this little book. The story of its writing and of its transmission from age to age will be recounted in sermons, addresses, articles, and books during this quadricentennial year. It will be sufficient here to point out a few facts that should be kept constantly in mind.

It is a religious book, not a theological one,—written out of the experiences of a believing Christian soul. It is a confession of the heart, not of the head, and intended primarily for the heart, not for the head.

It is a personal book, not a church book,—born from an individual's life and meant for individual lives. True, it has become a confession of the church—its simplest, profoundest, most spiritual, most popular, most potent confession; and yet it is preeminently the confession of the individual members of the church rather than of the church as a whole.

It is a practical book, not a theoretical one—produced to meet practical needs, not to satisfy speculative cravings. It is capable of definitely practical uses, in the Christian home, for the religious development of youth, for the winning of adults for Christ, for the edification of the congregation, and for the inculcating of eternal verities into the life of even non-Christian groups.

This article endeavors to sketch succinctly some of these practical possibilities.

THE CATECHISM IN THE CHRISTIAN HOME

At the head of each part of the Catechism, Luther wrote: "In the plain form in which it is to be taught by the head of the family." He conceived of his little work

as a book for the home. But in our homes today it finds little or no place. Here is an opportunity—than which in Christian education there is none greater—practically lost in our age. Let the Catechism be restored in this quadricentennial year to our homes!

It can be done with but a modicum of effort. If pastors will speak seriously to their congregations, their brotherhoods, their women's societies, and stress the importance of this home instruction; if they will show their members how it can be done by practical demonstration; if they will send or give to each father or head of the family a copy of the Catechism (without explanation; just Luther's text itself); and if they will from time to time remind parents of this sacred duty and privilege, it can be done.

But how use the book in the home? Surely every Christian family has some sort of family devotion. Let the usual volume used for this purpose be laid aside for a month or two. Let the head of the family take Luther's Small Catechism and read each day a single section: a single commandment with its explanation; a single article of the creed with its explanation; a single petition of the Lord's prayer with its explanation. Then let him (or her) tell briefly in simplest language what this means for every Christian, what value it has for life, and let him now and then add a bit of personal experience, a personal testimony to his children, and let there be spiritual seriousness and fervor in his words. Then let there be a free prayer—often a rephrasing of the part read—carrying the whole thought into the presence of God. What a blessed experience such moments would be for the whole family group! Five minutes at the breakfast table would suffice. Never were five minutes better spent in a Christian home.

THE CATECHISM AND THE YOUTH OF THE CHURCH

No book has larger possibilities for the instruction and inspiration of young people than Luther's Small Catechism. The church knows this, but sometimes forgets it. Here is a book that, if properly used, can impart life's

most vital truths, can mould character, can implant standards, can motivate activities, can form habits, can control life. A marvellous book!

Let it be used in the Sunday school,—not as an exercise in memorization, valuable as that may be; not as a formal part of a formal service in which the parts of the Catechism are parroted alternately by superintendent and scholars; but as a focalization of the lessons learned in the classes. There is scarcely any lesson studied in the course of the year which does not find expression in some part of the Catechism. Let each teacher in summarizing the lesson (whenever possible) point out: “And that is what Luther meant when he said . . .” or “That is exactly what our Catechism teaches . . . (quote) . . .” or some such statement. The whole teaching of the school will be focused on the Catechism, and the Catechism will be directed to life. Gradually the truth of the Catechism will be implanted, gradually its influence will be felt, gradually life will become Christian. (The same holds true, of course, for week-day and vacation schools).

Even more important is the Catechism in the Confirmation Class, the pastor’s own hours with his children. Never should he delegate this task to another, no matter how competent that “other” may be. Never should he allow these hours to find him unprepared, no matter what other duties may have consumed his time. Never should he conduct these classes in a haphazard, indifferent way. They are more important than preaching.

Let the pastor use these hours, not to drill his class in committing the words to memory, not to question his children about historical facts, not to inculcate a miniature dogmatic—these are not the purposes for which we have a Confirmation Class—but to impart to the child vital religious truth and vital Christian life. This is the time and this the place to augment and focus and revitalize all the child has learned in its home and its church school; and, where there is no such former training, the effort must be made to provide that training in extra hours before the Confirmation Class or in addition to it. The pastor’s class itself should endeavor in a personal, intimate

way to present the reality and eternal worthwhileness of our faith; and the Bible, the church's history, the church's creeds and liturgies and hymns and prayers, and the pastor's own experience should all make that reality and worthwhileness clear, attractive, acceptable, and spiritually creative.

THE CATECHISM AS AN EVANGELISTIC INSTRUMENT

More and more the church is realizing that it must reach out and reach those who are outside its fold. The millions who are uninfluenced by the Evangel of salvation must be won to its truth and life. Congregational Evangelism, Visitation Evangelism, Personal Evangelism, Lay Evangelism are some of the slogans of the hour. They tell of serious efforts to bring Christ to men and men to Christ. Much is being done; more remains to be done.

In this task, the Catechism can be made to have a large place. Experience teaches us that persons who are "converted" either in public meetings or by personal contacts are not by that fact necessarily faithful Christian disciples. Men will write on a card "I accept Christ" or "I desire to join the church"; but that does not of itself make them confirmed Christians. More is needed than a little persuasion, be it emotional or intellectual, be it public or private; men need conviction, deep-rooted, deep-seated conviction, and it can come only through knowledge, through experience, through understanding.

The Catechism offers a powerful instrument for the real conversion of lives, a spiritual sword for the thrusting through of sin, a spiritual lamp for the guidance of life, a spiritual link for the reunion of man with God.

Let the congregation and its individual members, clerical and lay, witness for Christ, invite to fellowship, show the way to God; then let the pastor form his adult Catechetical Class of those who would "accept Christ," of those who would "join the church" and let him personally, intimately, seriously reveal the heights and depths of Christian discipleship and church membership. Out of such classes will come Christians indeed,—informed, en-

lightened, convinced, converted, sanctified by the power of the Word of God, the power of the Spirit of God.

Of the methods of forming adult classes, we shall not treat. There are many methods and many books depicting them. The necessity, the possibilities, the supreme values we would urge. Adult classes—at least one a year; possibly two or three—in small groups of eight or ten are within the field of every congregation. We have neglected this opportunity and have lost its blessings. Let this quadricentennial year of Luther's Catechism find us again utilizing this opportunity for the extension of Christ's holy church.

THE CATECHISM FOR THE CONGREGATION

The simplicity of the Catechism, its "plain form", commends it for use among children and among non-Christians who desire to know the truths of the Christian religion. Nevertheless, it is a deep mine of spiritual wealth that can not be exhausted in the few hours of the Catechetical Class, whether children's or adult. Into that mine the preacher should go again and again to find ever new nuggets of spiritual gold. These he should hammer out into beautiful treasures for his congregation.

No congregation ever outgrows the revelation contained in the Catechism; no Christian ever reaches the point where its teaching is valueless for his life. No pulpit can afford to leave unpreached the values that lie in this book. If it leaves them unpreached, it omits from its impartation the vital centers of Christian life; it becomes, what so many of our pulpits today have become, peripheral, superficial, external. It would be a definite gain to our pulpit ministry to saturate our sermons with Catechism truth and Catechism spirit and Catechism life. It would be a definite gain to our congregations to have them permeated with Catechism faith and Catechism spirituality. It would be a benefit and a blessing for our people to hear again the great, simple, central truths on which our church, our salvation, our Christian life rests. In this quadricentennial year, let our sermons speak these religious realities until they become vivid again in a mem-

bership which has almost forgotten them. Mid-week services would profit by being turned for a season into discussion groups where the parts of the Catechism could be freely discussed. Interest would not be lacking; all the problems that are confronting modern minds in religious thought would come to the fore and pastors would be given a splendid opportunity to learn what their own people are thinking and to direct that thinking into right and fruitful channels. But the presentation, whether in sermons or discussions, must not be dogmatic, stiff, stereotype; it must be free, living, vital. Men, who want religion at all, want the substance, not the bric-a-brac of religion; and the substance is in our Catechism.

THE CATECHISM AND THE NON-CHRISTIAN WORLD

The Catechism, as we have seen, has large practical possibilities in the life of the church; it has practical possibilities also in the great world about us. Many men and women will probably never be brought into the Christian church, but that is no reason why we should not do all in our power to bring Christian influences to bear upon their lives. Many persons are living upon Christian resources, by Christian standards, with Christian motives and objectives, though they have not become disciples of our Lord. They have felt and responded to Christian stimuli, sometimes unconsciously. The lives of Christians, our church edifices, magazine and newspaper articles, even our bulletin boards have not been without power.

Similarly the Catechism can be made in a very practical way to change and lift life. The suggestion has been made that during 1929 parts of the Catechism be placarded along our highways, in our street cars, everywhere, and without any indication as to who is responsible, so that no direct church gain be sought but that the truth might produce its own fruit in its own way. There is a better way. Why not use our church bulletin boards for this purpose? Why not set up some striking sentence of Luther's Catechism such as: "I believe that Jesus Christ is my Lord Who has redeemed ME", and put it

where men can read? That is witnessing! Why not have a group of churches advertise in a block in the newspapers and insert in the center of their church notices some portion of the Catechism? Such presentation does have influence, and it is all for good.

Let this Four-hundredth anniversary record that we have in every legitimate way presented to all who would give attention the great basic verities of our Christian faith! Let our homes, our schools, our pulpits, our advertising focus for a season upon these vital things that mean salvation and peace and joy and life eternal!

FINDING AND FACING FACTS IN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION¹

M. HADWIN FISCHER
GETTYSBURG, PA.

In spite of the fact that Pennsylvania enjoys the unique distinction of leading the Sunday school world in enrollments, a glance at "the news" headlined in our metropolitan papers tends to create a feeling of uneasiness. Neither platitude nor statistics can evade the facts of living. The measure of our civilization is recorded in what the world accepts, or at least in what it permits.

For years the public has been exploited by political juggling, economic manipulation and social duplicity. Little eyes and ears are not slow to register what "gets by", or worse, what wins approval at the fireside or on the curb. Parental boasts of questionable gain at the breakfast table are apt to result in youthful efforts to outdo paternal leads. Coarse references in thoughtless jest are apt to inflame minds unskilled in consequences and self-control. The age, intoxicated with prosperity tends to wreck itself in the abundance of seeming and perish in the exactions of reality.

Two humiliating facts must be faced. Children are forming habits of conduct that tend to degeneracy. Youth flushed by the glow of its immaturity lifts its face in defiance of the conventional and rushes heedlessly into situations that try the soul. But we must not hastily draw conclusions. On the other hand are the numerous examples of the sublime self-sacrifice that has always been the glory and strength of youth. We believe in it. We glory in it. Never has an age produced such fine specimens of humanity as ours. This very fact lays upon the church the obligation to meet the needs of every child and youth coming within its sphere of influence.

What can be done? First let us find and face the facts.

1 Submitted as the report of the Commission on Religious Education of the Pennsylvania Council of Churches.

Then use the best known measures for meeting the situation and securing character-forming reactions. Hit-and-miss methods will have to give place to definite diagnosis, creation of desires, and to a definite plan of procedure that willful practice and revision of ideals and experience may lead to symmetrical, wholesome character. The process leads through the intricate maze of multiple situations with their varied appeals to the attainment of ideals and their habitual expression in worthy conduct. The desired goal, though within reach, is attained only through intelligent, tireless service—a price quite beyond the reach of calculating Christians.

Two surveys will furnish us data for the present study. In an investigation that kept eighty-four people busy for four years Dr. Walter S. Athearn has arrived at some startling results. We have time for a mere glance at the findings. And what arrests us is not that childhood as such is so far amiss, as that growing side by side two groups of children on seeming equality are at opposite poles in ideals and conduct.

The fact of a large number of potential citizens who are growing into voters, parents and men of affairs, outside the range of religious instruction has been ably presented elsewhere. We are here concerned with outcomes and an effort to change the influences that fashion ideals and lay the sanctions that will motivate future conduct. The first step toward that end is a discovery of what childhood and youth are thinking. What is their conception of God, faith, obligation, loyalty, accountability. How do they feel toward their fellows, their parents and elders? We have time for discussion of only one brief phase of the problem. Let us learn the attitude toward honesty. What do children think is honest in the use of money?

The survey shows that eighty-four per cent of the children in the eighth grade of the public schools of a great city believe it is right to steal from any who get money dishonestly. And who get money dishonestly? These youthful citizens say bankers, lawyers, landlords, real estate men, street car companies, railroads, factories and big business generally. How do children arrive at such

conclusions? Certainly not through any positive teaching of public or religious schools. Yet the fact is they believe it is right to beat other people in the use of money if they can. Under such conditions it is not hard to understand why we have a forged check every three and a half minutes and a total theft bill of three billions every three months.

A second question arises in the use of overchange. Is the fare collected? Does the grocer give too much change? Is it possible to substitute for a commodity and pocket the difference? Do young folks ever spend the money given for the collection at the ice cream counter? Problems might be multiplied indefinitely. What are the facts? Dr. Athearn's survey shows that seventy per cent of the children tested with the handling of purchase money did not return the change. Then when confronted with the facts they lied about it. When the test was put on in Brooklyn, New York, sixty-six per cent kept the change and lied about it. In the town of Malden, forty-six per cent kept the change and lied about it.

Can this be changed? The experiment answers in the affirmative. The pupils were organized into classes and skilled teachers taught them ethics and religion. Improvement was noted after six weeks. In Malden after one year of teaching every child but one returned the change. That child returned the dime the next morning with the statement that she had had a bad night. No conclusion could be more sure than that children are at heart morally right, and that under the right influences will grow into honest, self-respecting citizens.

In the older children we have a problem much akin, which expresses itself in denials of the facts of religion held sacred by Christians. It is not unusual to find youths of varying ages denying the fact of God, the Divinity of Jesus, the resurrection, the reality of prayer and kindred topics. Some even go so far as to call the Bible "bunk." Whither will the nation drift with such leadership? How have some of our brightest youths arrived at such conclusions? Is it strange we have such episodes as those staged by Loeb, Leopold and Hickman?

A study of the home may offer a partial answer. Modern rush and methods of living have eliminated definite programs of religious instruction from most of them. The complexity of social life and its accepted codes definitely teach deception and brag about it. The inference is obvious. Where religion is held essential to character building the teaching of it is delegated to the church school, which in turn is often robbed of its influence by unwarranted criticism and neglect. Add to this the fact that great masses of children receive no religious instruction and it is not hard to locate the causes of skepticism and irreligion.

To this should be added an influence all too prevalent in some of our schools. Under the shibboleth of "science" or "scientific method" teachers who are the very soul of unscientific procedure are sowing seeds of atheism in most fertile fields. Parents are thought to be antiques. Glib statements and so-called authority complete the wreck. Only one side of the discussion is given. Recommended readings cover only the teacher's viewpoint. The result is a one-sided approach to life's greatest facts: facts beyond the measure of human tape—facts that can be verified only by living experience. And the sad thing about it all is that the boasted leaders are unaware that such experience is at all possible.

And once again we ask can this be changed? We believe it can. Our present crime wave results from the failure of society to teach virtue. The way to prevent crime is to teach childhood and youth a better way. Human nature is potentially what we make it. The church holds in her grasp the secret of a new civilization which awaits only the conviction that will pay the price in sacrifice and service commensurate with the task. That she has not sensed her full responsibility or taken her task seriously, is all too evident when inquiry is made into her methods. Not until she matches secular education with a scheme of religious training its equal or superior, can we hope to develop citizenship whose ideals and practices approach the standards of Him whom we love and whom we serve.

That we may be fair in this permit me to refer to a survey made to determine the church's appreciation of her educational task. Unfortunately only the larger schools responded. And the author could not afford the time necessary for personal visitation and survey. In all, reports were received on some 2500 teachers now at work with some 30,700 pupils in the church schools. Ten and one-fourth per cent were college graduates, a percentage above the average. Twenty-four and three-tenths per cent had high school or some college training. This is somewhat below the average. The balance of the teaching force was below this grade. We grant that this may be a mere matter of mechanics quite aside from spiritual efficiency. Yet we must admit that pupil respects will demand a high intelligence and skill in a teaching staff dealing with life's most sacred problems.

But it is not on this score that our accusation rests. The survey revealed that only twenty-seven and one-tenth per cent had taken any special training in equipment for their teaching task. Granted that secular skills will carry over into religious fields, we submit that one teacher in four making definite preparation for her task is an average too low for best results. Seventy-two and nine-tenths per cent making no effort to attain professional skill is a confession that the religious training task is not highly rated. And when it was discovered that only one person in forty-seven and nine-tenths per cent of the enrollment was preparing to teach we did not find it hard to account for some present day situations. When we remember that the survey covered the larger schools the results are more striking.

The method of securing results was also open to serious criticism. Thirty per cent of the schools made no effort to secure pupil participation. About twenty-seven per cent had participation in readings, songs, prayers, etc. Eleven and three-tenths per cent had special items, while four and six-tenths per cent had occasional young people's leadership, and an almost negligible group had children's choirs or dramatization. It would seem from this that the church schools were merely continuing the

"holding of classes" and using the telling process. Modern usage pleads for an opportunity in pupil experience and expression that will enable him to link instruction to life and find in himself the evidence that truth is true.

The study on purposeful effort of pupils brought a high rating, but unfortunately later studies centering in actual service reported were disappointing. The church must not be satisfied with a mere cultural emphasis, fine as that may be. Her task is unfinished until life is changed and conduct is properly motivated. This will be possible only when knowledge is buttressed with experience and both are dedicated to life's supreme task.

HOW ROME TEMPTED MELANCHTHON

J. A. FAULKNER

DREW THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

MADISON, N. J.

Luther had faults, but not that fault of indecision of temper to which truth and error are practically one. Melanchthon had faults, but not that peremptoriness of temper to which an opponent's views are necessarily wrong. Everybody knew that the latter was moderate, mild, united the humanist and the theologian, could edit a Greek classic as well as the New Testament, that he would go a long way for the sake of peace, and that he did not always agree with Luther. It is not to the discredit of the old church that she wanted to bring back this wide-viewing child of hers, providing her methods were honorable. It is the aim of this paper to tell how she tried to do it.¹

The papal legate Aleander gives a hint as to methods. Not by gifts. That would be godless. "But I think that one should soften with some flattering words and gracious treatment the angry and excited feeling which learned men, because they are depreciated, have against us. But he should do it in a way that these friendly bearings should seem free and out of his own heart." This must be done by trustworthy men, with a dexterity which guards honor, which does not forget the decorum of the papal Chair, which "entices through the granting of benefices, and thus leads back to the flock."

An opportunity came to "fish"—to use Aleander's word—Melanchthon. In 1524 the papal legate Campeggi and his young and accomplished German private secretary, adviser and interpreter Nausea, came to Stuttgart, and, as they heard that Melanchthon was visiting his old

1 No pretension is made to original research, but to bring Kawerau's results to English-speaking readers. See his articles in *Deutschevangelischen Blätter* 1901, Heft 3 und 4, and especially his *Die Versuche Melanchthon zur Katholischen Kirche zurückzuführen*, Halle 1902. References have been verified.

home at Bretten, Nausea was despatched to try his luck. "I have become acquainted with thy extraordinary learning through manifold literary proofs, and so not only heartily value and love, but very respectfully revere thee"—a compliment richly deserved. He sounded Melanchthon on his relation to Luther, and gave him promises in case he left him. The great scholar replied that what he recognized as true he did so on account of the truth itself, not out of regard for men, prejudice, or a career. He would never separate from the proclaimers of this evangelical doctrine. In the future as hitherto it would be his endeavor to set forth this pure doctrine without disparagement of opponents and without love of strife. He hoped that all would work for the common good.

Melanchthon followed this with a letter to Campeggi himself, whom he warned against the idea that it was a matter of Catholic ceremonies: it was a matter of conscience as to the difference between human and divine righteousness, true penitence and the certainty of salvation. They opposed ceremonies only as justifying before God; outside of that they kept them so far as love of neighbor and of peace urged this course. Churchly customs and rites were wanted for the sake of peace. Mass and celibacy had shortcomings which should be openly acknowledged. Public quiet would be served best by a pious and educated clergy; now the baiting of Luther proceeded from ignorant monks; on the other hand many who invoked Luther exploited the mob, who were not Lutherans at all.²

Campeggi then turned to Erasmus at Basel to see whether some other position than Wittenberg could not be secured for Melanchthon. The humanist answered that though he would gladly see him removed from this strife, he had no hope that he would recant or change his conviction. He wrote Melanchthon himself a characteristically Erasmian letter,³ praising him and blaming Luther's immoderateness and the recklessness

² *Corpus Reformatorum* i. 658.

³ Sept., 1524.

of many of his followers. In these troubled times he (Erasmus) tried to separate humanistic studies from Luther's cause, to help the gospel without tumult, and as a second Gamaliel to exhort emperor, princes and church heads to a peaceful treatment of this church strife. Melanchthon replied that Luther also regretted the recklessness of any of his followers, that such things had nothing to do with the truth of his doctrine, which Erasmus himself could not deny was the gospel. "I cannot with good conscience condemn Luther's teaching; I could only do that when Scripture compels. Neither the honor of men nor scandalous phenomena can swerve me from this."⁴

The next project was to invite Melanchthon to Poland. The idea was to get him away from Wittenberg, from under the influence of Luther, and in some equally lucrative position. Cricius, the bishop of Plozk, who apparently had a high estimate of our Reformer, was interested in this. He wrote to the latter deprecating his abiding among heretics. Your great talent and high culture, he said, deserve eternal praise, and yet it is shameful when your name and learned work is and will be contemned by everyone. Take yourself out of these wild waves into a quiet harbor, and in order to care for your fame and studies. The change⁵ for which you are hoping, you will hope for in vain. Rather there will be a tragic issue.

Nothing came, however, of Cricius' well-meant endeavors to bring Melanchthon to Poland or back to the church, though these efforts were known in Rome and more or less favored there. Kawerau thinks that Melanchthon held out hopes, or at least did not give a decisive No. He also prints a couple of letters from Cochlaeus, secretary to the Catholic prince George of Saxony and later canon of Bresslau, and a fiery controversialist for Rome, in which he warns Cricius lest he himself be led to Protestantism by the hypocritical acts of the Reformer, and represents the latter as the most dangerous enemy Rome

⁴ *Corpus Ref.* i. 667 ff.; 674 f.

⁵ Greek word *katastrophe*.

has, as the one from whose writings the Danes, Swedes, Norwegians, Prussians, and Livlanders have drawn their hatred to Rome. Evidently that keen fighter Cochlaeus had no hopes whatever of Melanchthon.

Erasmus is now brought on the scene. On July 20, 1530 the Reformer writes to the Humanist saying that he has heard with joy that Erasmus has written the emperor urging him to moderate counsels, and that he hopes the Humanist will continue in the same line.⁶ The latter replies coldly that he has written only to the papal legate Campeggi, to the bishop of Augsburg and to other friends in that sense. That is always his endeavor, but so far he has reaped poor thanks for it. Rather may you (Melanchthon) exhort your people that they cease by their obstinacy and abuse to incite the princes to war. And he closes with the words, "May God keep you for us well-preserved and unconsumed".⁷ A year later the Humanist writes to von Pflug, canon afterwards bishop of Naumburg, highly regarded as negotiator by Charles V, to this effect:

Melanchthon worked in Augsburg untiringly in the same direction as yourself. If my health had allowed me to appear there I would have united my efforts with his. But how much he accomplished,—that is clear. For there were people there who proclaimed the most innocent and honorable men heretics only because they had a few conversations with Melanchthon. (He adds this general judgment.) Outside of his excellent culture and rare eloquence Melanchthon possesses a graciousness not to be withstood, for which he has to thank rather his genius than his disposition, in virtue of which he not only stands in the highest favor with all noble men, but which gives even his enemies no reason thoroughly to hate him.⁸

But in the spring of the year 1534 Luther made an attack on Erasmus, and the general feeling of the Evangelicals on the latter's *De amabili ecclesiae concordia* was far from favorable. This feeling in its turn made things harder for Melanchthon. There was a passage in the new edition (1535) of his *Loci* which naturally made the

6 *Corpus Ref.* ii. 232 f.

7 *Ibid.*, ii. 244 f.

8 *Opus Epistolarum Erasmi*, Basil. 1558, p. 1000.

Humanist think that Melanchthon was striking him: There are sirens who yield and bend, favor the old rites, make plausible explanations, and they are to be feared as much as the old sophists (scholastic theologians). These Humanists stand in favor with men of power. But they are really skeptical, and lead either to general doubt or their own decision is left in the air. Erasmus was justified in asking his friend whether he had him in mind. Melanchthon wrote:

In no passage in my book did I wish to attack you, in whose judgment I lay so much store and whose favor I so highly value. In fact you see how much I have taken from you even in matters of dogma. I could bring forward many witnesses of my high estimate of your person. For I revere you not only on account of your spirit, extraordinary learning and excellent qualities, but I join in your views on many controversial questions. Therefore I pray let any inimical feeling go, and be assured that I most highly value your authority and friendship. The books published against you here (Wittenberg) have displeased me not only on account of my personal relations to you, but because such writings are against the common good. And this opinion I have never concealed.⁹

Melanchthon goes on to speak of his difficult position.¹⁰ He has no pleasure in the sharp and paradoxical words his Wittenbergers indulge, and he has himself endeavored to shape dogmas in more attractive forms, though not without danger. He is now an old man, and it would be inexcusable if he had not learned to handle doctrinal questions more circumspectly.

On June 6, 1536, only five weeks before the weary Dutch scholar laid down his pen forever, Erasmus answered that he was glad the dark clouds of suspicion had been so quickly scattered; he asked pardon, but Luther's abusive words excited him. Besides he suspected that Melanchthon might have been displeased that he (Erasmus) had in earlier letters allowed reflections on Luther's friendship with Amsdorf. In spite of this he objected to points in Melanchthon's writings.¹¹ This did not, however, dampen the latter's friendship, as we

9 *Corpus Ref.* iii. 68 ff. (May 12, 1536).

10 Writing now in Greek.

11 *Ibid.*, iii. 886 ff.

learn in a letter of a Wittenberg student, July 29, 1536, to the effect that "Melanchthon is on the point with rector Malchius and other masters to take a journey to his home; in this journey he desires to meet Erasmus, who has expressed a passionate longing to see Philip and to speak with him. But there are those who say that Erasmus is dead."¹²

Had Erasmus sent a letter asking the Reformer to visit him? If so, did he wish to sound him as to leaving Wittenberg for good, and perhaps his work of reformation? Was there anything in the report that Melanchthon did not care to return to Wittenberg at all, as he was no longer of the same opinion with Luther and the others there?¹³ Was it to this time, asks Kawerau, that Melanchthon looked back when he said, "I thought of the time when some one threw up to me that I was trying for a cardinal's hat."¹⁴ He did not have to try. If he had shown desire for a return to Rome, the hat would have been thrown at him with alacrity. But it was an age of rumors and slanders, and a man must be judged not by these but by his deliberate writings and lifelong attitudes.

After the death of Erasmus Sadoletto came forward. He was an educated Italian Humanist, bishop of Carpentras near Avignon, France. He wrote a Commentary on Romans in 1534 and wanted reforms within Roman lines. In 1536 he was called to Rome to work on a Commission entrusted with that task. In December, 1536, he was made a cardinal and on June 19, 1537, he wrote a friendly letter to Melanchthon, of which this is the substance:

At Carpentras I read your writings and have been pleased with your spirit and elegance of your style. This made me desire to strike up a friendship with you. But I found myself entrusted with affairs of the coming Council and with the duties of Cardinal. Now, however, I write to testify my love to you and the high esteem I hold your excellent qualities. For I am not a man who can hate another because he disagrees in opinion. I am inclined to gifted spirits and scientific studies. I should love so learned a

12 He had died July 11.

13 *Ibid.*, iii. 193.

14 *Ibid.*, vi. 881.

man as yourself, and I have no doubt you reciprocate. For nothing low or sharp can dwell in so gifted a man. I hope we can come into connection with each other. I should like to show in some practical way my love to you. Please give me a chance. I am inclined to friendship and alliance, and witness again my love and my constant attention to leared men.¹⁵

This was an embarrassing letter. If published it put a strain on the orthodoxy and good reputation of both. It is evident that the Cardinal believed that Melanchthon was halting between two opinions, that his relations with Luther were not as cordial as formerly, and that attention and token of affection from the Roman camp would not come amiss. And did the passage about the "conversion of the sinner from the error" come into his head? Anyhow it made an impression on the Reformer. Unlike the letter to Cricius he did not keep it secret, but showed it to his friend and former pupil Camerarius, now Greek professor in Leipzig, and sent a copy to Dietrich, another pupil, formerly Luther's amanuensis, now preacher in Nürnberg, though with the caution to be careful to whom he showed it. Melanchthon himself was not over-cautious. The letter became well known in Wittenberg. A student wrote that it occasioned great surprise; it was elegant and friendly, but the impression was that it was not entirely ingenuous. Poor Philip did not know whether to answer or not. After two months he wrote to Camerarius that he had not yet answered Sadoletto's letter, but expected to, when he would speak in private friendship only and never mention church matters. But he delayed so long that word reached Philip that the Italian was displeased at the long silence, which in turn displeased the Wittenberger.

Meanwhile in 1537 the manifesto *Consilium de emendanda ecclesia*, signed among others with the name Sadoletto, came out in Rome. This contained the not at all surprising information that the *Colloquia* of Erasmus was not fit for youth and that its use in schools should be forbidden. As Luther shared this view, a view not unjust or unnatural, ¹⁶ I am surprised at the anger of

15 *Corpus Ref.* iii. 379 ff.

16 Unless the *Colloquia* were severely edited.

Melanchthon. "It is psychologically explainable," says Kawerau, "that delaying and undecided, anxious over the judgment of his Wittenberg associates, time for the answer to the letter so long elapsed, he now sought for something to get indignant over in regard to Sadoleto, and so Erasmus offered him the handle!" (p. 33). From now on he had a sharply unfavorable judgment of Sadoleto, and allowed him to go unanswered.

The latter himself had his own troubles for this well meant epistle, and especially by our fiery Catholic friend Cochlaeus and by Fabri, bishop of Vienna, was soundly rattled for it. But space will not allow a synopsis of their letters and the fine letter of the Italian in reply.¹⁷

Luther took a good-natured attitude to the whole business, quite different from the legendary Luther of Catholic biography. He treated it almost as a joke:

What kind of humility of Satan is it to turn such excellent men as Philip and Butzer (Sadoleto wrote also flatteringly of the latter) from the Gospel! Why, if our Philip would only say so he could become Cardinal and even keep wife and children. Satan keeps no holidays, but goes around to devour. Therefore let us watch.¹⁸ Sadoleto wrote to Master Philip most friendly, but very deceitfully, after the Italian way, perhaps that they might bring him by a Cardinalate to their side, without doubt from command of the pope. For those fellows are uneasy; they don't know how to go about it...¹⁹ (May 8, 1539): Philip is too modest; by his modesty the papists only swell up, for he would serve all out of love. If they came to me, they would get a bad jolt.²⁰ He had no fear of losing Melanchthon.

We come now to the Roman nuncios and agents and interesting little sidelights in church history. At the Augsburg Diet of 1530 Melanchthon himself made the surprising offer to the legate Cardinal Campeggi of obedience on the part of the Protestant party to Rome if the latter would close her eyes to certain innovations. It was a difference in rites, not in dogma, which stood in the way of harmony. These differences were over the cup to the

17 They will be found almost in full in Kawerau, pp. 40-47.

18 Förstemann-Bindseil, *Tischreden* iii. 390.

19 *Ibid.*, 274.

20 Loesche, *Analecta*, p. 369.

laity, marriage of priests, and leaving monasteries. If we take dogma as referring to the doctrines of the ancient ecumenical councils, there was truth in this, but protests had made a wider sweep. Was Melanchthon morally certain that even that minimum would be rejected by Rome, so that he was safe in laying down conditions so modest? At any rate formal answers strongly in the negative were soon returned. But to Melanchthon himself rich financial rewards were offered if he would work on the evangelical princes, and if unsuccessful leave his party for the Roman. We have no word of his own as to his reaction to this, but we know he received no money.

With such measures two things were disconcerting: one was the attack on Melanchthon in Eck's *Catologi haereticorum*, which appeared at this time, and the other was Melanchthon's Apology for the Augsburg Confession. Of the latter the famous papal legate Aleander, who had crowned himself with glory at the Diet of Worms by his three-hour speech against Luther, said that it showed more traces of obstinacy than any previous heretic or Melanchthon himself, and also how false were the hopes that Melanchthon might be converted. "It is a book full of sweet poison and deceiving words calculated to seduce the very elect, much more the whole scoundrel-crew of the devil's dinner table." Like a swing went back and forth Catholic relations to our Reformer, now violently attacking him, as Cochlaeus did in his *Velitatio* of 1531 and much more exhaustively in his *Philippicae quatuor in Apologiam Phil. Melanchthonis* 1534,²¹ while Aleander still cherished hopes for his return, seconded by Vergerio, the papal nuncio of the court of Ferdinand, who brought the good wishes to that end of pope Clement VII. But how they approached our hero is not clear.

Other attempts were made. Near the end of 1537 Bracetto came from Paul III, called on Dietrich at Nürnberg, got a recommendation from him, and thus armed sought Melanchthon. The latter was much pleased with

21 Though ready 1531.

the humanist culture of the Italian, his amiable way, and his skill in Latin in the happy imitation of Catullus. Whether he broached church questions we do not know. On his return to Italy he called on the papal diplomat Rorario, and laid before him a plan to call Melanchthon to Italy. Both thought highly of the Wittenberg Professor, believed that his influence on Germany was great, and that his conversion was most desirable. They thought also that his poverty would make it easier. The proposed General Council at Vicenza (later Trent) would give a chance, namely, by the emperor commanding Luther, Melanchthon, etc., to attend.

Meanwhile Bracetto would go back to Germany, assure Melanchthon of the pope's good intentions toward him, and of the rich rewards which would be his if he came over. Bracetto had hatched quite a scheme for getting Melanchthon into Italy, but Kawerau thinks he did not lay it before Melanchthon, and that a good deal he communicated to Rorario and to the pope was made out of whole cloth.

At the Worms Colloquy of 1540, called by the emperor to compare differences, presided over by his counsellor Granvella, our former friend Nausea, court preacher of King Ferdinand, approached Melanchthon with an offer of private conferences, to which the Reformer acceded, though taking his colleague Cruciger with him as witness. At the first meeting, after friendly greetings, Nausea reminded him of their old acquaintance at Bretten, of the reverence he always had for him, and now at his own (Nausea's) instance he wished to confer on religion: Do you suppose that out of this colloquy a true, firm, wholesome union can take place? Or are there better means to restore peace. He conjured Melanchthon on account of the high favor which he enjoyed to use his influence to help Germany to peace. Melanchthon replied that the questions were too difficult for simple answers:

We have already spent two lost months here. No one knows how this colloquy will begin or end. This is owing to the disunion and grumblings of the Catholic side. We fear the Evangelicals will

grow tired and leave. Three conferees on each side would have been much better than eleven; they then could come to an understanding on Augsburg Confession and Apology. If they could not agree then let theologians, only German, however, nominated by emperor and king, seek some common formula. In that case I would use all pains that something might be done. In private writings both sides have failed. At least I have.

Nausea in reply to this suggested to Melanchthon that he prepare a union Confession taken impartially out of the Augsburg Confession, Apology and Catholic Confutation.

The next day Melanchthon wrote to Nausea that he had previously communicated with the president of the Colloquy, Granvella, and he could not prepare anything on unofficial requests. Two weeks later Melanchthon sent another brief letter to Nausea, commiserating him on his illness and adding that the fundamental articles of the evangelical doctrine he could not suppress, but over the others he would lead no strife.

On January 10, 1541 (ah, what glorious times those were when nobody was in a hurry!) our Reformer found himself in the quarters of the still suffering Nausea, accompanied again by Cruciger and now also by Butzer. He assured his old Catholic friend that he was still willing to make the colloquy a success. But there were two enemies, those who obstinately held to their own opinion against all common ground, especially the monks who were at the colloquy, and the papal orators and doctors who as at Hagenau so here opposed every composition, and cared nothing for the truth. This sufficiently frank utterance²² did not offend Nausea, who, however, said that Melanchthon judged mistakenly the papal deputies, who were now strongly inclined to an understanding and were not to blame for the Hagenau failure: There are enemies of peace also on your side. In any case, count on me to do all I can for it.²³ Later Nausea had to defend himself

22 Was Melanchthon encouraged by the presence of his two assessors?

23 Kawerau for these private conversations—not mentioned in the Lives of Melanchthon—drew from a book immediately published (1541) under the auspices of Nausea, *Colloquia Privata*, etc. See note 131, p. 83.

at Rome for his part in these meetings by the reasonable consideration that only thus can we understand the feelings and opinions of opponents, and those who without bloodshed desire to heal the schism will find in such discussion much food for thought.

Kawerau remarks that never as in these days of the Colloquies 1540-41 were Catholic theologians so much inclined to come to a fair and friendly adjustment with the Reformation. In these transactions it did not have to do with making Melanchthon a convert, but only to use him for this adjustment and through him to work upon his party. Of course that shows that it was hoped to find in him not an irreconcilable opponent but a friend of reunion. So on the other side, our fiery friend Cochlaeus was present at Regensburg, where a union colloquy followed within a couple of months after Worms, but he sadly confessed that in these irenic transactions "as in Worms, so here, no use was made of me."

We come now to the last effort to win Melanchthon. Under the hard pressure of political conditions our Reformer had given a consent to a revised and weakened accommodation with the Catholics, the so-called Leipzig Interim, which raised a storm around that head accustomed to many knocks, though perhaps the worst were yet to come. A strong party of Evangelicals raised against him a standard on which they subscribed the name of Luther, and the Gnesio (genuine) Lutherans separated themselves from the Philippists, it being understood that the former were the uncompromising enemies of the Roman Antichrist, the latter inclined to concessions. This of course became known in the Roman camp, and the natural query arose whether this was not a good time to sound Melanchthon again: a natural conclusion even if the letter of April 28, 1548 were not known, the letter to von Carlowitz, Counsellor to Electoral Prince Maurice, in which he disowned responsibility for the Reformation, and complained of the servitude he had borne so long at Luther's side.

In September 1551 the Council of Trent reassembled again, and it was understood that according to the will

of the emperor Protestants should appear. On December 13 our Reformer received a sudden call from Maurice to go. With sad heart he started January 1552 for Nürnberg, where he had to await further instructions. What hopes were raised when news spread that Melanchthon was on his way to Trent, and in the imperial court at Innsbruck had met his former pupil the Imperial Vice-chancellor Seld! The latter had received the false report that Melanchthon desired to appear at the council. Seld's heart was joyful:

Now Germany will come to union and peace. The presence of Master Philip "as a peaceful man will be most useful. All of us hope that he will first put before all other affections and terrors the honor of God and his holy Word, and then the honor which we all owe to the Christian church and our holy Fathers, and lastly the love of our common fatherland. Thereby he will receive the reward of the Almighty and the praise of all the goodhearted, so that we can say '*unus homo nobis dicendo restituit rem*!'" To this end "open and notorious abuses" must be abolished on the Catholic side, "suspicious doctrines" on the Evangelical, and both must in catechism and the necessary ceremonies come to an understanding. For this, thought Seld, Melanchthon was the mediator.

More sanguine were the hopes of Bertano, nuncio of pope Julius III, just now at the court of the emperor at Innsbruck. I understand, he says, that Melanchthon is not firm in his views, and has longings for relief from his difficult position. If I could win him, what a gain! Not because Germany would then be ready to put faith in him, but because in that case, having taken offence at him, she would put faith in none of the other theologians. Therefore if the pope thinks it best, I shall try to win him, yet with such skill that he will have no opportunity to glory thereby. But for that it is necessary that one be able to offer him a fixed income, as it may appear good to the pope. Thus Bertano the good bishop of Fano! He does not think that success means that all evangelical Germany will immediately follow so distinguished a convert, but that his apostasy might shatter their confidence in all their theologians. Man proposes, God disposes. The pope was not well, and later might answer the nuncio. But when on Feb. 9, 1522, a longer answer was returned

to Bertano, there was silence on the Melanchthon question! Meanwhile political events dispersed the Council of Trent, our careworn Philip never went farther than Nürnberg, and Bertano never had a chance to try his skill. And thus ended the attempts to win Melanchthon over.

Thanks to Kawerau, this is the substance of a chapter in church history little known. A word or two in closing.

Why did Catholics venture on this hunt at all? (1) Though Melanchthon was a theologian he was also a Humanist. The *beata tranquillitas* had a strong appeal. Köhler, the Luther expert, thinks that this troubled his clear view on the theological side, and as to union transformed absolute oppositions into relative.²⁴ (2) He had keen feeling for political peace. "Politics makes strange bedfellows." Anything for peace. "God overturn the counsels of those who think only of war," he cried.²⁵ (3) He was a delegate in many conventions for peace. When you are an arbitrator, when you are regularly chosen as one whose duty it is to seek a composition of difficulties, you come to have a different bearing from the diehard, from the fighter to the last ditch. (4) It was well known that Melanchthon deviated from Luther in some things, and that at times their relations were not the pleasantest, though this deviation was exaggerated and a good deal of nonsense was talked about it. But it existed, and it naturally led to attempts at his perversion. (5) The catching of such game was worth while. Who knew to what it might lead? So Rome thought.

Really, however, was there hope of success? In my judgment, none. The differences between the two Reformers were child's play beside the deep chasm which separated both from Rome. As to the Lord's Supper, which played such a tremendous rôle in the theology of that era, Melanchthon was farther away than Luther, and every day with the study of the ancient Fathers he was growing farther away. The first condition of reception would be the dogma of 1215, and what chance did Rome

24 *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1902, 698.

25 See Ellinger, *Melanchthon*, 1902, p. 262.

have with that? Only yesterday I was reading that the three main questions the German delegates to England in their Reconciliation visit this summer (1928) put to Anglicans to determine their nearness to Rome were these: What is your attitude (1) to the teaching infallibility of the pope, (2) to the use of Latin in worship, and (3) to celibacy of the clergy.²⁶ They were sure that if the Church of England showed any large trend in these directions she was headed for Rome. Where did Melanchthon stand as to these three? Any wavering?

Rothe says: "Whatever happened at the time of the Reformation for the building up of an evangelical theology in Germany in the field of exegesis, dogmatics, and even the history of doctrine was his (Melanchthon's) work. The special founder of a German evangelical theology was Melanchthon."²⁷

As to Roman theology he is sufficiently critical. "Is the doctrine of Thomas and Scotus anything but a barbarism in which two evils unite, an uncultured, all too garrulous philosophy and a heathen cultus, particularly misuse of Lord's Supper, service for the dead, and monk's superstition. This darkness the Lord drove away in infinite mercy when the light of the Gospel was again kindled by Luther, and God again called back the church to the sources."²⁸ All the time he held the Lutheran doctrine to be truly Catholic, and in his paper to Maximilian II said that a union of the two Confessions was impossible.²⁹ In regard to the two Interims, can we assume that their concessions would have been made if they consciously presaged conversion, or that their Protestant opposites would have been given up at that price? Perhaps this gives his thought in a nutshell: "We follow the manifest and certain teaching of Divine Scripture, nor do we depart from the Creeds, but hold what they aim at and wish, though sometimes they are unable to make clear."³⁰

26 *The Guardian* (London) July 13, 1928, p. 435.

27 Quoted by Herrlinger, *Die Theologie Melanchthons*, 1879, p. 462.

28 *Corpus Ref.* xi. 786 (1548); Herrlinger, *op. cit.*, p. 453.

29 Herrlinger, *op. cit.*, p. 299.

30 *Corpus Ref.* xxiii 634; Herrlinger, *op. cit.*, p. 302.

JOHN WYCLIF

CHARLES M. JACOBS

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

"On most of us the dim image of Wyclif looks down like the portrait of the first of a long line of kings, without personality or expression—he is the first of the reformers." With this quotation from the first of the line of Wyclif scholars of the nineteenth century,¹ Workman opens his two volume work on the life and times of the great Englishman of whom everyone has heard, about whom everybody knows a little and nobody very much.

Amator anguli, "a lover of the corner," so Luther described himself in 1518. The description fits the Englishman far better. He loved the shades of Oxford, and he succeeded in wrapping them so close about him that the modern scholar is baffled when he seeks to penetrate them and bring their occupant out where men can see him. Through the shadows we perceive only a scholar, spending his days in the laborious study of a few great books, emerging at set times to lecture, dryly and learnedly, to his classes, and going at vacation-times into the parish, from which he had his living, to minister as a simple parish-priest, and writing, wrtting,—writing books that caused popes to issue bulls of condemnation, synods to sit in solemn judgment, a nation a thousand miles to the East to rise in rebellion against the papacy after he was dead and just before the ashes of his exhumed body were scattered on the waters of the Swift.

There were a few years of his life, indeed, when he was greatly in the public eye, but even the Wyclif of those years is little known, for they were years of party-strife in England, and Wyclif had not formed the parties. Courtenay we can still see clearly; Courtenay, bishop of London, promoted to the see of Canterbury, arrogant, high-handed, proud to be the servant of "the servant of the servants of God," excommunicating all the Florentines in England and explaining that the pope had ordered it,² condemning Wyclif's teachings behind the closed doors of a semi-secret synod,³ but not venturing to condemn the man himself. John of Gaunt we

**John Wyclif. A study of the English Mediaeval Church.* By H. B. Workman (1926).

England in the Age of Wyclif. By G. M. Trevelyan (3rd ed. 1904).

John Wycliffe and His English Precursors. By G. V. Lechler; trans. by P. Lorimer (2nd ed. 1884).

1 Shirley, in *Fasciculi xizaniorum*, p. xlv.

2 Workman ii, 51; Trevelyan, 79f.

3 Workman ii, 258 ff.

know; John, Duke of Lancaster, able, cynical, ambitious, "the head of a small but well-organized hierarchy of knaves" who ruled England in their own interest, the evil genius of his father, Edward III, and the plague of his nephew, Richard II.⁴ These men we know. Each had his party and between them there was continual struggle. Parliament was their chief battle-ground, but Parliament was changing as the times changed and was beginning to be given to outbursts of independence, now of the church, now of the noble, and ignoble, lords.

Through the dust of this arena we see again the form of Wyclif, but we see it dimly. He is no party leader, but he has a party which takes him up, invades the chapel where he is answering to charges before a church court, and carries him away before his answer is given, forbids his removal to the court of Rome, protects him in his declining years, and delays the church's verdict upon him until thirty-one years after he is dead. And yet the party that supports him cares little for the things he cares for most of all. It uses him to provide a theoretical justification for the things that it already wants, and has long been trying, to do. It wants to stop the flow of money out of England into the coffers of the pope; it wants to check the growth of wealth in the hands of the church in England; it wants to take from the church, and especially the orders that are vowed to poverty—the Dominicans and Franciscans—some or all of the wealth that they already have. That will hold down taxes; incidentally, it will enrich the Duke of Lancaster and the coterie of nobles that support him, and it will increase the swelling in the money-bags of the great London merchants, already grown plethoric. A scholar, especially a very great and learned scholar, who can prove from Scripture, from the Fathers, and from the doctors of the church that such a program is just and right and laudable, may be allowed a little heresy. He is too useful to be put to silence, merely because he rejects transubstantiation and believes that the pope is "a poisonous weed," "a limb of Lucifer," and "a more horrible idol than a painted log."⁵ So Wyclif gets a party. We may say that it is behind him; but in the records it is in front of him; it fills the foreground, and we have to look through it to see the man. We never see him plainly.

To be sure, Wyclif did make one party of his own, but the men who composed it were not the kind of people that fourteenth century chroniclers wrote about. It was a party of nobodies, men who did not strut in silk and velvet, but went in home-spun about their daily toil. It was they whom, in his heart, Wyclif cared for most. They gathered in quiet corners, remote from observation, and listened to the teaching of Wyclif's "poor priests."⁶

4 Trevelyan, 10.

5 Workman ii, 80 f.

6 Workman ii, 201 ff.

Oxford scholars some of these "poor priests" were, others were men devoid of learning, but not of earnestness and simple zeal. Almost ostentatious in their avoidance of outward show, they went about in robes of russet wool, "their only possession a few pages of Wyclif's Bible, his tracts and sermons,"⁷ teaching his doctrines, avoiding "taverns, hunting, and chess," given to "studious acquaintance with God's law, plain preaching of the Word of God, and devout thankfulness." We like that last! Persecuted and driven from place to place, they are still to be devoutly thankful.

We do not know all that they preached. There was economic and social TNT in some of Wyclif's doctrines, as there was in some of Luther's. Perhaps the preachers spread those doctrines too. At all events the year 1381 witnessed the first of the long series of popular uprisings that culminated in the German Peasants' War in 1525.⁸ The tide of rebellion rolled up to the very gates of London. Of course it was blamed on Wyclif, but not with entire justice. Wrongs had existed for generations, but when men have no rights, how can they be wronged? Revolutions grow out of men's convictions that they have rights which are denied and that the "rights" of certain others are wrongfully enjoyed. The rebels did not get their revolutionary convictions out of Wyclif's books; these were beyond the understanding of the peasant mind, but even Einstein's theory of relativity may conceivably have practical results some day, and practical things are revolutionary, when they are new. Perhaps the "poor priests" did spread sedition, some of them knowingly, others not; perhaps, again, they did not lay the mine, but only touched off the fuse already set. But the explosion came and raised another cloud, this time of dust and blood, between us and the real John Wyclif.

And so it comes about that no one has yet written a real biography of "the first of the Reformers," and no one, in all likelihood, will ever write one. All is known about him that will be known. Workman, more frank, perhaps, than others, calls his work "a study of the English mediaeval Church," and every student of the mediaeval Church knows that its history is the history of society. Few great men have ever been so completely obscured by their environment.

What, then, is this Wyclif? He is a voice. The man eludes us, but the voice persists. He is a name for a writer of many books. The great edition of the Wyclif Society contains twenty-two titles and some of the titles run to several volumes, and these do not include his English works at all. Very varied the titles are. He writes "Of Blasphemy," "Of Simony," "Of the Power of the Pope"; books with such titles we would expect to understand. He writes "Of the Church" and "Of the Truth of Holy Scripture"; but he also

7 Workman, l. c.

8 Workman ii, 221 ff.; Trevelyan, 183 ff.

writes *De ente*, and *De ente praedicamentali*, two whole books about the *ens*, that key, forged in the brain of Aristotle, with which the mediaeval philosopher believed that he could unlock the secret of the universe; that ultimate "Being" which underlies phenomena, which is not solid, though it may have solidity, is formless though it may have form, and colorless though it may have color. *De potestate papae* any one could write, but not *de ente*; that was for the initiate alone. It was books like this, and the *Triologue*, that won the man the respect of the schools. Ground enough here there was for that clash of academic opinion of which they were so fond at Oxford and at Prague; in opinions *de ente* deep and dark heresies might lie, but there was nothing in them that was world-shaking. Interestingly enough, when he wrote *de ente*, Wyclif was a strong conservative.

Not so when he wrote on government! To this subject he devoted a whole vast treatise;⁹ its thousand pages make four volumes, now that it is in print. That we should have it in only a single manuscript is not surprising when one thinks of the labor of copying such a work by hand, but that was the kind of thing that students of theology did, when they wanted to become learned men. *De civili dominio* was a *locus*, a topic of theology; of course it was. It was the theologians who fixed the theory of society, of the state and the origin and limits of its powers. Why not? The state came from God, and whatever came from God belonged somewhere in theology. For centuries it occurred to no one that there might be a theory of the state with which theology had no concern. One man before Wyclif's time had, indeed, suggested such a thing. Marsiglio of Padua, a Paris lawyer, had set up a theory of the state based upon human rights, but he had shocked conservative opinion so profoundly that he had had much ado to keep himself outside a papal prison, and had become anathema, *damnatae memoriae*. The theory of the state was theological and had to be.

The theologians had been busy with it for three hundred years. For those three centuries the actual powers of the state had been in vigorous dispute. The arguments had started back around 1076, in the troubled, turbulent days of Gregory VII, when popes began to try to depose kings. Such a procedure needed theoretical defense, and was open to theoretical attack. It is an old and unsolved question whether theory prompts action or justifies action that men are inclined to take before the theory is formed; the latter would seem to be true at least as often as the former. At all events, the discussion of state-theory runs through all the later Middle Ages; it was a part of the process by which the European nations came to self-consciousness. Seldom have there been such theorists as the scholars of the later Middle Ages, Wyclif included;

9 Cf. Workman i. 257 ff.

rarely have men been so able to make theories ends in themselves. To us practical-minded folk of the Western world, theories are chiefly means. The Europeans call us superficial; they say that we are pragmatists and opportunists, incapable of producing great theologies and great philosophies; perhaps they are more nearly right than we are willing to admit.

Wyclif was a theorist. His works on government were so theoretical as to be utterly impractical. His theories, if actually applied, would have produced a state of anarchy, in which no one would have been sure who had the right to rule him or who had a just title to the property he held. Workman holds, indeed, that Wyclif never intended that his theories should be applied at all; that he was simply describing a Utopia which was never intended to exist save in the minds of men. But Utopias are dangerous pictures to put before practical minds; one wonders why the Utopias are not censored as other pictures are. For every Utopia is a criticism of what is, and Wyclif's is no exception to the rule; on the contrary, it is replete with blistering, blasting criticism of his own England and most of all of the church, in England and out of it.

"Dominion is founded in grace." In that simple sentence Wyclif's theory is classically described. Dominion meant to him, and to his age, two things together, two things that we moderns try to hold apart—wealth and the right to rule. The right to rule was based upon possession; how could one rule what was not his? The modern communist is turning that question around and asking, why should not all of us own what all of us rule? In theory, the king was the possessor of his realm, the baron of his barony, the abbot of his monastery and its appurtenances; therefore, he ruled them, and ruled those that lived within or upon his lands. That was good feudal theory, however bad modern political science it may be. But every lord and every baron might lawfully be dispossessed, if he failed to perform the customary duties to his overlord; indeed he held his lordship on the condition that he render those feudal dues. That was the scheme of government that Wyclif knew, and within this circle of ideas his doctrine of dominion moved. God is the Overlord of all the earth, the world is his possession and the men who rule it possess it only as his "tenants." They have their "dues" to pay, duties to render to their Overlord. In default of payment, their lordship is forfeit, though the forfeiture may not be enforced. The wicked have no valid title to possessions or to rulership; the earth and the dominion over it are for the righteous.

Dangerous doctrine this, and "full of dynamite!"¹⁰ A king's title stands in God's grace alone and is not valid if the king be

wicked, when Edward III is spending the last years of an ignoble dotage in the arms of Alice Pervers! Righteousness is the condition of possession, when the popes are claiming more and more wealth and power and maintaining at Avignon the most notorious court in Europe, when English Parliaments are passing statutes of praemunire, forbidding appeals to the pope, and statutes of mortmain, to check the growing wealth of the great monastic orders! To the righteous belongs dominion, when the proletariat are reaching eager, empty hands for a portion of that dominion which worldly clerics and immoral lords enjoy! Yes, "full of dynamite" indeed!

It is well enough to say that Wyclif, in his Oxford study, was a theorist, who did not mean his doctrine to be taken seriously enough to cause a revolution; but Wyclifism, denied of its technicalities, was an invitation to do some very stern and practical, and possibly some very violent things. Even the feudal background of it, which makes it so foreign to our modern ways of thought, put it within the comprehension of the fourteenth century, which thought of dominion in feudal terms. And Wyclif did not hesitate to suggest some applications. He had very specific and very hard things to say about rulers, especially about the rulers of the church, and about clerics who grow rich.

The work on dominion was only a starting-point. It was followed by others, equally revolutionary, and far more outspoken in criticism of the church. Wyclif believed that the church was thoroughly corrupt and located the focus of infection at the papal court. He held that the true church is the totality of those whom God has predestined to salvation, and this true church can have no head but Christ. Therefore, the church which men's eyes see does not need a pope; but if it has a pope, he must be a spiritual man, and to Wyclif that meant a man who disdained wealth. Most of the church's many ills can be traced to the root of avarice, and the cure for them is impoverishment; take away the church's wealth and the church will be reformed. The state may administer this drastic remedy—a doctrine welcomed by John of Gaunt and his coterie, in a day when the church held one-third of the land of England.

"Apostolic poverty!" That was the formula with which Wyclif aimed to purify the church. It was not a new idea; it had entered the church with Francis of Assisi and had never been forgotten; it was the ideal of perfection which thousands were pursuing in their private lives; but Wyclif wanted this formula applied to the whole ecclesiastical establishment. He would have taken things back to the happy state in which they were at the beginning.

A real "reformer" this! All of them want to go back to some golden age of Christianity and make things over on that model. "Apostolic poverty!" These have been the watch-words of all the

reformers, from Marcion to Wesley. They have forgotten, or have never learned, that there has never been a golden age. Wyclif did not realize that the days of Peter and John were also the days of Simon Magus, and Ananias and Sapphira. Nevertheless, there is real power in the idea of a return to apostolic things. It does carry men back to the pure springs of Christian truth and Christian ideals; thus it permits Christianity to be reborn time after time throughout the centuries.

It carried Wyclif back to the Scriptures. They became for him the one authoritative source of Christian teaching and, because he held them to be this, he made them his standard for the criticism of the church of his own day. But Wyclif did not go to the Scriptures with an unbiassed mind; few men, if any, ever do. He was too much the schoolman, too tangled in the scholastic intricacies of theology. When he made the church the assembly of the elect, he was speaking the mind of Augustin, not the mind of Paul; when he quoted the Scriptures in support of "apostolic poverty" he was defending a thesis that he believed before; and where in Scripture can we find God pictured as a feudal monarch, granting "dominion founded in grace?"

He gave the English people a vernacular Bible; or did he? The scholars do not know.¹¹ Like all the rest of his doings, Wyclif's work as a translator of the Scriptures is shrouded in obscurity. There was, of course, a "Wyclif Bible," and it did come out of the circle that Wyclif influenced most deeply and directly; he had some part in making it; but whether his part was large or small, we cannot tell; at all events it was not completed until he had been dead for some ten years. It had no great circulation; how could it have before the days of printing? Then, too, it was unlawful to possess a copy of it, after 1401, when England got its law *De heretico comburendo*, and heresy became a capital offense. It had no such formative influence upon English religious thought as the sixteenth century translations had, in their time, upon the peoples to which they came. It remains a monument to the industry and zeal, the ideals and the hopes that existed in the circle of Wyclif's closest followers.

From the standpoint of the Bible, as he interpreted it, Wyclif attacked the "abuses" in the church. There were enough of them, both in number and variety. Penance, indulgences, relics, pilgrimages, worship of saints—around all of these things superstitions had collected; these must be done away. Most of these practices had become means of gain; that must be stopped. But when this is done, Wyclif finds very little left of the practices themselves. About purgatory—that threat with which the church was holding its subjects in continual fear—he was agnostic; perhaps there may

be a place of final preparation for the bliss of heaven. Transsubstantiation in the Mass he utterly rejected, holding that "of all the heresies by which the church has ever been infected, none deceives the people in such various ways; it robs them, renders them idolaters, denies the faith of Scripture, and, through this infidelity, moves the Truth to wrath."¹² Yet Wyclif would not deny the Real Presence; if it had been he that Luther met at Marburg, they would not have disagreed. So, too, if he and Calvin had sat together to discuss the nature of the church, they would have found their minds close together.

Yes, this Wyclif is a voice, crying aloud to a generation that would not hear, crying against deep-rooted and inveterate wrongs and abuses and corruptions and falsehoods. He is an honest voice utterly sincere and wholly fearless, a voice of protest, calling to repentance and amendment. The voice was loud enough to be heard, in its own day, across the seas; it spoke the language of the schools, but plainly enough to be understood by schoolmen; John Hus relayed it to the market place and it rang loudest in the streets, not of London, but of Prague. The man himself is gone from history; his figure is concealed behind the jostling, pushing crowd, struggling for baser things than those to which he was vainly calling—for wealth and that "dominion" which he told them must come from God alone. For centuries even the voice seemed gone, lost in the clamor of contending parties; but in this last hundred years, thanks to the scholars, we can hear it once again, "the voice of one crying in the wilderness," 'Prepare ye the way of the Lord.' "He anticipated most of the negations of Protestantism, but the Gospel of the Reformation he did not know."¹³

¹² Workman ii, 39.

¹³ Loofs, *Dogmengeschichte* (4th ed.), p. 634.

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

CHURCH HISTORY

Christianity, Past and Present. By Charles Guignebert, Professor of the History of Christianity, University of Paris. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927. xxvi + 507 pages.

When one for the first time glances at the well-designed, attractively colored paper coverlet of this book, his curiosity is aroused—much as that of the novel reader who finds himself facing an array of “best sellers” in a large bookstore. His suspicion of, and experience with, clever advertising may impel him to pass on with frigid indifference. Now, a church historian cordially greets a new work in English on general church history, whatever its coverlet may be; for the English in writing on general church history seldom get beyond the first six centuries, though they have much to say about England at any time. The translations of German works, again, are too much confined to antiquated editions to be of any “scientific” use. The Americans are still too interested in the “Acts of the Apostles and the acts of their grandfathers” to attempt much at general church history. Therefore, a welcome to Guignebert’s recent volume, which has been excellently translated.

But, back to the design on that coverlet. It presents a staircase of twenty steps, assigning a century of history to each step, and thus reminding us of the Magdeburg Centuries, with Flacius’ atomistic treatment of history, as if history is controlled by the divisions in the almanac. Yet Guignebert’s book is anything but analistic. It operates a great deal with syntheses, and has much in common with the new trend known as philosophy of church history.

The advertisers’ staircase is, however, symbolically right, by including the Apostolic Age as a part of church history, for fully one-fifth of the book treats this period. This is comforting to some of us who have to defend the historical treatment of the Apostolic Age as a part of church history. Recently I was confronted by the exclamatory question, a little irrigating in tone: Whoever heard of a church historian teaching the Apostolic Age? I did not debate the question, but I thought of Weizsäcker, Baur’s successor as professor of church history in Tübingen. I thought of Albert Hauck, the prince of church historians, and of his successor Heinrich Boehmer, both of whom lectured on the Apostolic Age. Yes, in running over the names of some two score and a few more present day professors of church history in German and Scandinavian universities I was not able to find any that did not treat the Apostolic Age as a part of church history. Then I visualized a large

black tome in English, by August Neander, covering this age; another, of some 900 pages, *Apostolic Christianity*, the first volume of Philip Schaff's *History of the Christian Church*; a third by Arthur McGiffert, President Union Theological Seminary, *History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*; and then, James Vernon Bartlett's *The Apostolic Age in Ten Epochs of Church History*. Of course, New Testament exegetes write on this subject too, but from a different angle, being more given to the analytic than to the synthetic and perspective method. An exception is Th. Zahn, who, however, because of his patristic studies, is as much a church historian as an exegete.

Professor Guignebert approached his task as a well-equipped historian, thoroughly at home in the complementary branches of history of religion, philosophy, church law, history of doctrine, archaeology, and in the historical auxiliary sciences of paleography, epigraphy, diplomatics, etc. He is at home in Oriental and classical languages; and utilizes the research of German and English scholars as well as that of the French and Italian. He thoroughly knows the contributions of Catholic theology, and he is well acquainted, though perhaps to a lesser degree, with the investigations carried on by leading Protestant scholars.

He does not write history "to order"; that is, in the interest of a denomination, but he writes as objectively as it is possible for one who does not rubricate as a Catholic or as a Protestant, or as a synthesis of the two. Naturally, the Roman Catholic church as a system and institution gets most of his attention. He gives it a severe treatment, but not as a partisan advocate: rather as a sober judge who decides a case on its own merits. In other words, he tries to be faithful to the task of a historian, which task is difficult in the light of the equipment with which the average student comes to his lectures and writings.

Professor Guignebert regrets that only three of the universities of France (continental universities have no undergraduate departments) have been provided by the State with professors for the special purpose of studying church history. (In America the situation is even worse). He says that although these three professors attract many hearers, they still win but a small number of students. "It cannot be otherwise as long as our young men come to the universities without having had the attention drawn to such questions by their teachers in the secondary schools, [including colleges]." This regret may be shared, only more keenly, by the American professor having to deal with students who have been systematically victimized by colleges whose modern curricula—"neither fish nor fowl"—spell chaos and mutilation, compared with the curricula and pedagogy of the lycée.

Grant that we begin with the Acts of the Apostles. What is the approach? No longer exclusively the approach of classical philol-

ogy, or of patristic philology, or of the koinē, or of the religio-historical school (also Talmud and Midrash), or of the dialectic, or of the psychologic method ranging from *Einfuehlung* to *Gestalt* (also Formgeschichte). But all of these approaches—perhaps even *Schallanalyse*—are necessary; and not only for the first century, but for the first three, to say the least. Guignebert correctly avers that the history of Christianity during the three centuries in which the church was constituted, has been worse served than any other branch of general history. "It is right and necessary that we should not forget this fact. As for church history in general, hereditary prejudices still taboo many questions."

In Guignebert's discussion of Jesus we could have wished for the perspective of Karl Heim, as revealed in the volume *Glaube und Leben*. The Jesus of our volume is too little the Christ. We could have wished for Reinhold Seeberg's fine discrimination in discussing the terms the Son of Man (a title of exaltation) and Son of God. We could have wished for Albert Hauck's discernment in accounting for the action of Jesus during his passion. The following from our author sounds too much like Renan's school: "Jesus had not foreseen what would happen. The terror and flight of his disciples are plain proofs that he was taken by surprise. Pilate's decisive blow caught him still deeply dreaming" (43). He does not hold that Jesus was bodily resurrected. Now, Ludwig Ihmels, in defending the bodily resurrection of Jesus, admits the difficulties in the accounts of it given in the New Testament. Reinhold Seeberg grants the shocking possibility of the body of Jesus being lost among the rocks when the earthquake occurred, but maintains the real resurrection of Christ. Whatever the difficulties be as to the accuracy of text and visions, Karl Barth's dialectics (*Dogmatik* I) surmounts them by making the resurrection a counterpart to the virgin birth, which he, disregarding the argument about native sin (because native sin can be inherited from mothers as well as fathers) and entirely eliminating the question of sex, unhesitatingly accepts, and that with good reason. This procedure lies hard by the new school which, like Spengler, sets aside causality and teleology, and argues for the organic conception of things instead of the mechanistic. We therefore add Barth to the list of names which Guignebert might have considered, though the former's *Dogmatik* appeared later than Guignebert's book.

The extent of the influence of Eastern religions on Christianity is documented too readily by our author. Here the reserved attitude of the Swedish theologian Hjalmar Holmquist is the more commendable. For who can always distinguish between analogy and genealogy? The findings of our volume are not in entire agreement with the research of the last decade, unless research be

recognized, as such, only among the theologians on the Protestant left, and among the extreme modernists of Catholic antecedents.

Startling is the unproven claim that the death of Jesus makes no impression upon the Twelve of an expiatory sacrifice. Surely the What of this sacrifice impressed them, though the How and Wherefore of it may not have been equally plain to all of them. Our writer claims that the Twelve never would have described Jesus as "Son of God" but merely as "Servant of God." He holds that the Kyrios title, applied by Paul to Jesus, is of Syrian milieu. But what about the Septuagint, which Paul knew so well? Has Bousset said all that there is to be said? Or Adolf Deissmann? Again, have Reinhold Seeberg's and Karl Barth's works on dogmatics, more representative of the right wing, nothing to advance beyond Bousset?

Other terms and methods of argumentation used by Paul are discussed in our volume. But, again, it pays no attention to Paul in the light of philosophy. It was a deed of church historical significance, when Professor Hans Leisegang in Leipzig, a few years ago, delivered a series of lectures on Paul, in the Faculty of Philosophy. Hans Leisegang's *Der Apostel Paulus als Denker* (1923) is a profoundly illuminating work, showing that the Apostle's logic was neither western nor rabbinical, but uniquely Pauline. Leisegang, doing full justice to "*innere Form*" and "*geistige Struktur*," and grateful for the *material* which the religio-historical school has gotten together, says that in order to understand the product of a writer like Paul, it is not sufficient to consider the *material* alone: two other factors must be studied—the writer (creator) and the meaning of what he writes (creates). Adolf Deissmann, it is granted, has described Paul as a creative author, in the atmosphere of the countries on the Mediterranean. "But what about the product and the inner form and spiritual structure of this product, detachable from the material and personality?" This has not been sufficiently considered in the work before us, which discounts Paul as the "founder" of the church and substitutes almost unknown builders of the Church of Antioch.

As to Christ's attitude to a visible church, Guignebert holds (as Karl Mueller (Tübingen) and most European Protestant scholars do) that Christ neither founded nor expressly desired the visible church. In question of polity and organization he follows Hatch and Harnack, apparently being not acquainted with the far superior school of Sohm, which properly makes the church a work of the Spirit, and not of one or many "founders."

The chapter on doctrine and discipline contains nothing new. The chapter on the conflict of the church with the state and society is written with much understanding of the factors involved, and of the results following.

Part II, The Middle Ages, Theology and Papacy (201-359) in seven chapters, is more or less of the traditional order, though with a sparing treatment of persons, the emphasis being laid on following up the idea at work in the given movements and periods. The author shows how superstitious popular religiosity and mysticism stripped Christianity of much of its original strength. Illuminating are the chapters "Scholasticism," "The Opposition to the Church" in the form of religious sentiment, anticlericalism, scientific spirit, and free thought. A fine appreciation is given of Eri-gena and Roger Bacon. A critical treatment is received by Sacerdotalism, the Babylonish Captivity, the Great Schism, the Papal Triumph over the Attempted Reform. All of this is to show that a religious revolution in the form of the Reformation was inevitable.

Part III, Modern Times, Politics and Roman Catholicism (363-507). This is the most interesting part of the volume. Humanism is treated sympathetically; but the Reformation very inadequately—in fact, constituting the weakest chapter in the book, considering the rich literature we have on this subject. The Counter Reformation is sketched briefly, but more judiciously. The Jesuits receive a fairer treatment than they usually do at the hands of non-Catholics, the author not being far from Heinrich Boehmer's judgment about this body, holding that its main faults are not Jesuitic in particular, but Roman Catholic in general. Great sympathy is shown to the Enlightenment, which is accorded far more space than the Reformation. A chapter on Liberalism, Criticism and Science versus Theology strikes especially at the Roman Catholic church, though the inadequacy of eighteenth-century criticism is admitted. The author accepts Darwinism, which he calls the doctrine of *transformism* against creationism; and claims that transformism, in spite of the Pope, is accepted *in toto* by educated Catholics. But what about Oswald Spengler, the most challenging and widely read author of our century, who calls Darwinism and evolutionism a caricature of justification by faith? The author strikes hard at the *authority* of the Catholic church. We approve of that. But will not science then be *his* authority? Is science infallible? Has it said the last word? Will not the transition be from a fallible quantity claiming infallibility, to another fallible quantity claiming the same miraculous virtue? Is not the latter authority also exceedingly relative, and can it be anything but a scaffold for religion? Can science, a quantitative factor, improve something qualitative like Christianity? It can brush aside error and make the foundations of the Roman Catholic church quake. But it cannot produce pure religion, a gift from on high, independent of time in its extensional sense, and independent of causal and teleologic factors. For Christianity, contrary to the

author's opinion, is not the natural outgrowth of its social milieu. It is not evolutionistic, and is on another level than science.

Emil Brunner well says: Truth is not what is proven in a scientific laboratory. This "truth" offers nothing new; it merely adds, arranges what already is. Philosophy, too, looks for truth, but as a spectator, as an esthete. But in religion one has the "passionate yell" for truth. Here truth is a matter of life and death, where man answers the Word, or call of God. The author's standpoint is too much the synthesis of science and religion.

But mighty are his blows against Romanism, where even this standpoint gives him the advantage. For Rome combines superstition and religion. With marked vitality, impressive scholarship, intense candor, and dignified scorn, he scores the fateful deeds of an old church—too old to change—and predicts its end. There is enough dynamite in the final chapter of the book, "The triumph of Romanism," to keep the sincere and scientific part of the Catholic press busy for years to prevent ignition of the explosive ingredients that Guignebert has worked into the cracked walls of the self-styled infallible church of God.

Says Guignebert: "Why is it that so many eminent thinkers, one after another, are breaking away from the Catholic teaching?... Unfortunately for 'the Catholic Church' inexorability and immobility have no possible chance of promoting the human concerns of the Church.... The scientific movement... is only departing further and further away from it." Even for a Catholic to criticise an unsigned Syllabus of a pope is a penalizing deed, as was seen in the case of the well known historian Paul Viollet.

"It seems as if the main anxiety of the Roman curia has long been wont to give offense to the unlearned, that is not to give them any cause for uneasiness respecting the invariable stability of the doctrine, and thus keep them strictly bound to an obedience, blind, but regarded as salutary." Two recent acquisitions to the dogma are the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception and that of the Papal Infallibility. The latter doctrine plunges the papacy "still deeper into medievalism." New saints have been added to the calendar. Gross thaumaturgy is practised. "Ecclesiastical authors are stooping to the most compromising exploitation of popular piety or credulity." "The parasitical devotions are often merely scandalous commercial undertakings; even swindles, sharing profits with important church works.... The official church is dominated by the letter and by superstition.... In our days many priests bring their instruction to bear solely upon the great spiritual affirmations of religion and ethics; they neglect dogma deliberately and in this way adjust Catholicism to the practical needs of the faithful.... Today political prejudices and class interests have drawn many people into the Church, or drawn them back again, people who are only troublesome members of the flock from

all points of view." The hope for the 'Christian' results of the war and the triumphant Catholic revival has been disappointed. "There is constant talk throughout the world of Catholic action and propaganda." But the "recruiting of priests in many Catholic countries is becoming so difficult that some bishops show they have become seriously disturbed about it. The number of the faithful who are assiduous in their attendance at public worship is decreasing more or less rapidly everywhere.... The Catholic church makes use of aggressive newspapers which feel no scruples concerning Christian charity and delicacy.... She attempts to realize her ideal by press propaganda, meetings multiplied and ever more huge congresses...in which she develops the seductions of liturgical pomp on the biggest scale and puts forth the greatest appeal to collective emotion.... She takes her hand in the great game played by the various parties centered around every government.... She has embarked upon an offensive for the support of the sectarian school. The battle will be waged... in England, and the United States and other countries, in which the Church feels herself menaced by state schools which are laic and sectarian. She has gained some active sympathizers in the Anglican High Church party and in the Lutheran Church in Germany.

"The education of her ministers in a seminary, which excludes the light from without, of a few men (always increasingly hard to find in enlightened circles) will not enable these young men to bend external realities to their biased minds.... The great majority of the faithful hold merely to the liturgy...not the dogma....The Catholic Church likes only the sciences which consent to carry her train.... The Church is scarcely more than the sovereign Pontiff...."

Guignebert is so convinced of Christianity being explicitly an Oriental religion, that he makes the overconfident claim that Western peoples, to a great degree, have never understood this religion. He says:

"Christians in name, but bearing the impress only of the Christian legend and nourished upon formulas passively repeated, these men—the vast majority of professed Christians—remained actually pagans, and still do so within the folds of the Catholic commonwealth.... The western peoples have, strictly speaking, never been Christians."

Guignebert has some hope for the Greek church, though it has not become any more modern than the Roman. The hour of the "laicizing" of culture is going to strike for her people. Their awakening will be a slow one; however they shall profit by the fact that they are not bound by any Council of Trent. But: "Catholicism, which has become Romanism, can no longer evolve."

Guignebert's fallacy is his identification of Christianity with the visible church, a confusion of a spiritual power with the historical

—often unintelligent and perverse—application of this power. Therefore he makes Christianity a religion undergoing the process of an evolution; a phenomenon that grows and decays, engendering a new religious organism from its decaying tissues; a complex of sentiments that will pass away, or, rather, be absorbed in the (imagined) great process of evolutionary progress. Herein he shares the views of Harald Höffding, the Nestor of Danish philosophers.

But supposing that Christianity is not a religion. More than thirty years ago Georg Sverdrup, the most keenly thinking theologian of American Lutheran church history, said that Christianity is the negation of all religions. He did not base this on the accidental fact, perhaps not given full cognition by the translators themselves, that the term "religion" is not found in any Lutheran Bible translation, certainly not in the German or Scandinavian versions. But he was seriously adopting the definition of Christianity, that it is man's restored fellowship with God, through Jesus Christ, in the Holy Ghost.

Quite recently, Professor Emil Brunner, the outstanding systematician of the Barth school, on his visit to America, stated to the writer that he could accept Sverdrup's conception of Christianity as the negation of religion, but preferred to call it the crisis of religion, since religion is always a *Lebensform*, subject to philosophic treatment, while Christianity is the Revelation of God in Jesus, or the Word revealing God to man—hence the object of theology proper.

But be this as it may, Christianity is not evolutionistic. It is Life, not a *Lebensform* changing into another form. It is the only resurrective power for a race in sin and in need of the removal of sin, the only thing that separates us from the fellowship with God.

Guignebert's volume has failed to present the antagonism of sin and grace. Therefore it misrepresents Paul and lacks comprehension of the Protestant Reformation as a religious movement. Therefore it pins its faith in Science, which, after all, is relativistic, as is everything else that is temporal. Therefore its ascription of failure to Jesus, one of the chapters even having the blunt heading "Jesus' Failure." This view is regrettable, but self-explanatory in a Roman-ridden country like intelligent France, inclined to the extremes of "either-or," furnishing the environment for men like Renan in the past, and Loisy in the present—the land of Gallican liberties, of Babylonish pontifical captivity, but also of mysticism and ever-active Jesuitism. Such a land can more easily foster a Charles Guignebert than a Friedrich v. Hugel.

Guignebert is a clear thinker, but he is no Spengler—the Reverend John Haynes Holmes, to the contrary. His book is weighty, but it is not comparable to Frazer's *The Golden Bough*, the Philadel-

phia Record notwithstanding. It is, nevertheless, a respectable work of dignified polemical technique, wielded by a scholarly mind, and discomfiting to Romanism because of the author's carefully made diagnosis, predicting that "Romanism can no longer evolve."

Does this, then, mean the petrification, the death of the Roman Catholic church?

But, after all, is Romanism confined to the Roman Catholic church? Are not sections of Protestant bodies appropriating the spirit of Rome, gradually getting ready to receive the heritage and perpetuate the heathen thought of eternal Rome, of a *Rechtskirche* wielding a compelling Authority over souls, instead of setting forth for them the persuasive Gospel of Jesus Christ. Rudolph Sohm has well said that the essence of Catholicism is the confusion of the visible with the invisible church. Are we not guilty of this confusion, more or less? Are not our large councils assuming gestures of infallibility (if not in theory, then in practice), and are not our committees, dressed in brief authority, in danger of acting quasi omnipotent, "for the welfare of the church?" What dare they not tackle, these sons of "the free and the brave," who smile at the follies of Versailles and ridicule the bureaucracies of the Old World, only to reaffirm them on a smaller, but more laughable, scale in the New,—“church” acting as state with compelling mandatories, backed up by majorities which often, as of old, obstinately believe: *vox populi, vox dei*.

But “woe” to the critics of decrees and syllabi. Rome has one Index, Protestantism may have several, worst of all, perhaps, an anti-laic priesthood, which, like all human priesthoods, binds the consciences of men.

That grand scholar-saint Professor Karl Heim, far more dangerous to Romanism than Guignebert, controverts any priesthood which stands as a guardian of man's conscience, hindering him from becoming fully awake and keeping him in that state of transition, as to peace of conscience, which makes him lean on man—call him a priest—for support. As the priesthood binds the conscience, prophethood liberates it, continues Heim. “Protestantism has been a war of liberation of conscience carried on against the priesthood. This war began, not with Luther, but with Amos [prophet and layman], whom the highpriest wanted to exile, because the country could not bear his addresses.” Heim fears this priesthood. But he finds it also outside the Catholic church. He says it may assume a much more dangerous form in Protestant churches and sects than in the Catholic church. Therefore, let us be on our guard.

We may profit in a twofold manner by reading Guignebert's book. First, because it warns us against Pontificalism matured into Romanism; secondly, because it may force us to do a little sweeping before our own doors. Or, would such movements of the

broom be too readily interpreted as gestures of an innate incompatibility with the whole order of things, or of Edomitic hostility to the house of Israel—and finally reach a keeper of an Index?

We differ very much with Professor Guignebert, but we have enjoyed reading his book, at once a symptom and symbol of the times. His lucid, vital style has not suffered by its rendition into English, which has, with wonderful elasticity, happily Anglicized so many of the delightfully novel phrases and telling epigrams characteristic of the writings of Professor Guignebert. An index to the book is a desideratum.

JOHN O. EVJEN

Dictionary of American Biography. Vol. I. Abbe-Barrymore. Edited by Allen Johnson. 660 pages. Published under the auspices of the American Council of Learned Societies. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928. (To be sold at \$250 for the set of twenty volumes).

With the great interest that centers these days in biography it was to be expected that American scholars would undertake to parallel the British Dictionary of National Biography. That this great enterprise was undertaken by the American Council of Learned Societies, a federation of twelve societies devoted to humanistic studies, gives assurance that it will be done thoroughly and that it will be the most complete and authentic work of its kind. Dr. Allen Johnson, the editor-in-chief, was formerly Professor of American History at Yale. The associate editors also are men of intensive scholarship. Every contributor is chosen with reference to his special knowledge of his assigned subject and is subjected to most careful editorial supervision.

The plans for this monumental work were begun in 1922. Much difficulty was experienced in financing the project, as it was estimated that at least half a million dollars would be required merely to cover the cost of preparing the manuscript. It was Mr. Adolph S. Ochs on behalf of the New York Times Company who provided the subvention of funds necessary for this part of the work. The actual preparation of manuscript began three years ago.

The Dictionary when complete is to embrace twenty volumes, containing about 16,000 biographies written by several thousand authors in something like 12,000,000 words. It is planned to finish the entire work in ten years. No living persons are to have a place in the Dictionary, but the plan is to issue supplementary volumes from time to time so as to keep the work constantly up to date as one of the most valuable reference books on the shelves of libraries and educational institutions.

Every effort has been made to insure absolute accuracy in all details. Contributors have been instructed to base their articles wherever possible upon original sources of information and at the

close of each article to present a careful list of their chief authorities. Even our national heroes of the past are subjected to fresh independent study and balanced revaluation. Each subject has been assigned to the most competent writer available, and the sketches are all signed. The writers are requested to use terse, direct statement, to avoid rhetorical ornament, to appraise the circumstances and influences that shaped careers, to stress such matters as ancestry, parentage, childhood experiences, educational advantages, and physical and social environment, and so far as possible to leave the reader with a definite impression of the personality and achievements of the subject of each biography.

Next to the thoroughness of the work is the breadth of its scope. Earlier collections of biography naturally emphasized the lives of soldiers, statesmen, and clergymen, with a few scientists, artists, and literary persons. But during the last half-century the currents of American life and expression have widened and deepened so much that today we are interested in a great many other lines of contribution to American civilization. The new Dictionary, therefore, not only presents a reinterpretation of well-known personalities in the light of new information and new points of view, but it also rescues from obscurity many a life that until recently would have been considered too prosaic to be at all significant. The variety of profession and occupation represented in this work presents a kaleidoscope of real American life. In the first volume, for example, Bishop Asbury sits down alongside P. T. Barnum, "the great American showman," and scientist Agassiz rests under the same covering with ball-player "Pop" Anson, while Alvin Adams, the express man, comes under the same rubric as John and John Quincy, the presidents. So far as knowledge permits, therefore, the editors and contributors have tried to recreate and reinterpret the lives of the real makers of American civilization.

This first volume alone embraces the biographies of 660 men and women written by 294 authors, each chosen for a special knowledge of his subject. Evidently there has been much independent research in family records, official archives, diaries, letters, and genealogical repositories. We note that there are 69 pages of Adamses and 33 pages of Allens. We have the assurance that Lutheran writers are co-operating in the production of these volumes and that Lutheran subjects will be adequately presented. In this first volume we observe accurate and interesting accounts of such Lutheran celebrities as Israel Acrelius and John Bachman.

As the editors have succeeded in making the Dictionary a notable contribution to American scholarship and letters, the publishers have succeeded in giving it a form in keeping with its contents. This volume is beautifully printed and bound.

ABDEL ROSS WENTZ

Reminiscent Reflections of a Youthful Octogenarian. By George Henry Gerberding, D.D., LL.D. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1928. 294 pages. \$1.50.

Dr. Gerberding's autobiography is the frank record of a successful life. The book is very informal, not only in the materials presented but also in the manner of presentation, the conversational style, the moralizing tone, the interjection of anecdote, and the absence of all preface, table of contents, index, or running title. To follow this diligent and devoted man through the varied experiences of a long and busy life—the hardships of his early years, his education at Thiel and Muhlenberg and the Philadelphia Seminary, his pastorates at Mount Calvary, Pittsburgh, at Jewett, Ohio, and at Fargo, North Dakota, his professorship in Chicago, the "chapter of tragedy" there, and the beginnings of the new seminary,—is to take a turn through the history of the American Lutheran Church from 1847 to 1927.

Dr. Gerberding writes in a very interesting way about the events that took place and the people who crossed his path. Much of his life was moulded by "the magnetic, instructive and persuasive influence of Dr. Passavant." He was an incessant toiler as his many labors in the ministry and the many volumes from his pen attest. This last of his books, the story of his life, is in many respects the most interesting of them all because in it he voices without reserve his likes and dislikes of men and institutions and he divulges much inside information on points that might yet be controverted between partisans of the former General Synod and the former General Council.

ABDEL ROSS WENTZ

Die Religionswissenschaft der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen. Edited by D. Erich Stange. Vol. 4, Dalman, von Dobschütz, Garvie, Jörgensen, Jülicher, Kaftan. Leipzig: Felix Meiner, 1928. VII + 232 pages.

We opened the fourth volume of this series of autobiographical sketches of modern theologians with eager anticipation and were not disappointed. Just as in the preceding volumes, the human touch and the scientific confession of each author gives a better understanding of his theological purposes than would otherwise be possible. Not only does this series provide a clear outlook over many of the religious tendencies of the day but it records them for the future. What would it not mean for us today if similar sketches, written by the theologians of the past four centuries, had been preserved for our own times.

As in the previous volumes there are all shades of opinion, and from some of them we naturally dissent very emphatically. There are also many unconscious admissions that repeat some of the

facts we noted in the previous volumes: for example, the foundation of orthodox training that has so evidently and often admittedly been the real basis of the spiritual life of many who in their intellectual vagaries have subsequently wandered far afield.

Many sound bits of common sense are to be found expressed by those who certainly are not to be classed as especially conservative. The smart intellectuals of theology might well ponder von Dobschütz's statement on page 38: "I dislike all radicalism. I always feel that while such radical theology makes a great impression on youth, it does not further science as such. True, even the faults and errors of really great men have their value, but, apart from that, the desire to say something original has wasted much good energy and misled many a youthful spirit." "I have little comprehension of the joy in the use of catch words that is so widespread today" (p. 39).

Of the same sort is the statement of Garvie, whose long-winded description of his various writings is perhaps the most ponderous ballast the book has to carry, when he tells of his early acquaintance with five languages and adds, "I have noted these facts for two reasons, first because I am convinced that the knowledge of foreign languages should be regarded as an indispensable part of culture, and, secondly, because these facts explain how my genuine Scotch patriotism has always been modified by a spirit of internationalism" (p. 65).

The sketch that will probably most interest the readers of *The Lutheran Church Quarterly* is that of the Dane, Jørgensen, who has had such close connection with various American activities. He is one of those who has been closest in touch with the actual life of the church and with its practical operations. The account of his life shows clearly that the needs of the world will lead to very different conclusions concerning divine Revelation from those of the professor's study. Reality and speculation are by no means the same. Here we have a striking vindication of the confessional theology of the church as the theology that actually works, and, as if this should be confirmed by an opposite, we note that the one (Jülicher) who is most indifferent to the value of confessions is also the one who by force of circumstances as well as by inclination was most out of touch with the practical every day life of the church.

Jørgensen is a professed follower of Luther: "As a theologian I felt and still feel myself a disciple of Luther. I have never yet finished with his writings, but always find something new and living in his theology" (p. 132).

What he has to say about the confessional problem is so sound and illuminating that we must quote a little more fully. Speaking of those who consider the confessions a hindrance to the work of the church, he remarks: "On the other hand we see, particularly

among the American Lutherans, the growth of a strong new confessional consciousness, that has mightily strengthened the American Lutherans, and impelled them to engage in the help of afflicted fellow believers in Europe with an active love that not only sought out the suffering Lutherans and provided them with material aid but also gave them the spiritual comfort that comes from a common faith" (p. 147).

"The confessional problem in our day," he goes on to say, "is one of the chief problems of the church both in theology and in its practical work. I found it particularly burdensome in my own case, but gradually, through study and through the experience of the practical work of the church, it became clear to me that it is impossible to consider surrendering the confession of a church; on the other hand that the confession only has real significance when it really inspires the life and work of the church, so that this inspiration occurs under the spiritual guidance of the Word of God" (p. 147).

At some length and with manifest conviction he develops this theme. Unfortunately space prevents a more complete account. We can only take three striking sentences from the discussion to show the trend of the whole. "For a Lutheran it is therefore advisable (for orientation in the teaching of Scripture) to begin the intensive study of Scripture with a study of the most important Lutheran Confessions" (p. 151). "Stockholm (the Conference of 1925) has furnished the great historic evidence that *extra confessionem nulla theologia*" (p. 153). "Never again in the history of the church will it be possible in a conference to discuss 'life and work' without also considering doctrine" (p. 153).

Such are the opinions of a practical theologian. Equally well worth serious consideration is his rather startling suggestion that great good could be effected for the church by the establishment of an international Lutheran theological faculty.

JOHN C. MATTES

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY

Understanding the Apostles' Creed. By Donald McFayden, Ph.D.,
Professor of History in Washington University, St. Louis.
New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928. 318 pages. \$2.50.

This book has an aim. We shall give it in the author's own words: "Its writer begs that it be not judged as a contribution to the scholarship of the subject.... His aim is a humbler one: to place before the general reader an account of the oldest and in many ways the most interesting of the Christian Creeds, its historical background, and the thrilling experiences and earnest conflicts which gave it birth; and to explain, if the reader be interested, how one professional scholar at least, despite the fact that he is

daily exposed to all that is best in what we call the 'modern mind,' nevertheless can repeat its ancient phrases *con amore*" (Introduction, p. IX).

In the carrying out of this purpose there has been given to us an interesting book, the value of which is enhanced by the fact that it is the result of the studies of a historian rather than of a theologian. The old Roman Symbol, which is the basis of the Apostles' Creed, is considered at length and its merits and its defects freely criticized. The Creed is viewed as a reaction against Hellenizing influences, as represented in the Gnostic movements. One chapter is devoted to the Creed and Science. The author recognizes that Creeds have of necessity been slow to make adjustment because of a natural fear lest vital values should have to be sacrificed. He has a virile faith however that, though in particular instances, the church may have been seemingly defeated, she survived because she had the power to accept new ideas which were truer and perhaps more effective than those that were displaced. "The true continuity of the Christian Faith has been a continuity of usefulness. The practical postulates underlying the Christian life of today are essentially the same as those which underlay the life of the Primitive Church. There is little likelihood that these postulates will ever cease to be effective and necessary. The needs which they meet are needs of our unchanging human nature. We have every reason to believe that the convictions which regenerated unhappy and sinful men in the first century must have their modern counterparts, and that convictions essentially similar will be required by our remotest descendants. There is therefore nothing inherently absurd in speaking of the faith once for all delivered to the saints" (p. 293). While it would not be expected that one could subscribe to every position held by the author, we have found the book helpful both in the understanding and in the defense of this the earliest of Christian creeds.

JOHN ABERLY

The Case for Christianity. By Clement F. Rogers, M.A. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1928. 278 pages. \$3.00.

A book on Apologetics. It is however not intended primarily to meet the intellectual difficulties of the scholar but the difficulties as they have to be met in addressing a popular audience that is indifferent or hostile to the claims of Christianity. The author has been addressing such audiences for years in Hyde Park, London. He at the same time is Professor of Pastoral Theology at King's College connected with the University of London. This combination gives him a peculiar fitness to write a book on Apologetics. It keeps his defense of Christianity in touch with living issues rather than with theoretical problems.

The practical purpose of the author determines his choice of sub-

jects. In the opening chapter on the Things that Matter the reader is introduced to the objections to Christianity made by those who have been embittered because of supposed grievances. Christianity is presented as being on the right side on the very subjects that perplex men. A much-needed defense is the chapter on the Verdict of History. When one reads certain attacks on Christianity he might conclude that about all the Christian movement ever did in the world is to condemn Galileo, and burn heretics and witches. Without condoning these as due to a misinterpretation of the spirit of Christianity, the author yet shows on what a very one-sided view of its history such an evaluation of Christianity is based. In regard to the Trustworthiness of the Records the author is a conservative but one who gives, we believe, valid reasons for his position. The Person of Christ crowns the historical evidences, or, as the author prefers to call them, the evidences from Christian Life and Religion. The second part deals with the Evidence from Philosophy. The universality of law as postulated by evolution and attested by science leads to a First Cause. The intelligence that is shown in the order of the universe reveals God as Mind and Purpose. Conscience reveals God as Good. The Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man are grounded in the Christian doctrine of Incarnation and this rests on the doctrine of the Trinity. While these essential Christian truths are defended as reasonable, the appeal throughout the book is rather to the fact that Christianity is the friend and helper of man giving him right views of life and a worthy goal. It is a valuable addition to Apologetic literature. That value is greatly enhanced by the quotations from sources ancient and modern, from secular and religious literature, that illustrate and reinforce the arguments in favor of Christianity.

JOHN ABERLY

The Humanity of God. By John Wright Buckham, D.D., Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Cal. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1928. xiv + 265 pages. \$2.50.

The author tells us in his Preface that the original title chosen for this volume was *The Fatherhood of God and the Modern Mind*. After reading the book, we feel that the original title expresses much more clearly what the author has in mind than does the subject of the book as it now stands. Books have been written—not a few of them—showing that the Philosophy of Personalism better than any other philosophy accounts for all the facts of this complex universe. In this volume the author takes the reader one step further and shows that the Fatherhood of God, which is really the only conception of the Personality of God that matters, better than any other view clears up life's mysteries and makes it full of

purpose and significance. Tolerant as the author is towards every foreshadowing of this conception of God in other faiths, he is decided in his views that for a clear apprehension of it we are dependent on the revelation we have in Jesus Christ: "When we pass from these foregleams of Fatherhood to the faith of Jesus, we have passed from twilight to full day. Here, the conception of God as a true Father becomes a living reality" (p. 44). Nor does the author dissociate this teaching of the Fatherhood of God from its interpretation by Jesus' immediate followers, especially that by Paul. Christocentric-Christianity does not obscure it. "On the contrary, the truth of Divine Fatherhood was enriched, expanded, completed by having incorporated into it the personality of him who revealed the Father as no one has ever done" (p. 53). Equally strongly does the author set himself in opposition to those who think that the great theological controversies of the early church were something brought in from Greek sources that obscured the simple teaching of the Fatherhood of God. While the teaching is simple it enfolds in itself the root of a profound metaphysic (p. 70). "It is hardly too much to say that the conception of Infinite Personality as it appears in Lotze's *Microcosmus*, or Bowne's *Personalism*, or Howison's *Limits of Evolution*, or Webb's *Gifford Lectures*, or W. R. Matthew's *Studies in Christian Philosophy* represents approximately the philosophical counterpart of what Jesus meant when he called God: 'Our Father who are in Heaven'" (pp. 94, 95).

The difficulties that must be faced in believing in the Fatherhood of God, especially those arising from the facts of sin and suffering, are considered in a separate section. While not pretending to solve them all, this view of God can resolve them better than any other. The effect of belief in the Fatherhood of God is the last phase of the subject treated. Not only does it give the peace that comes from our being *at home* in the universe, but human brotherhood and all it involves, and the fulfilment of all good in other faiths in one religion are also thereby assured. No extravagant claims are made by the author as if every mystery could be solved. "To believe in God as Father is to go with reason, as far as it goes, and then beyond it, but not against it. Christian Theism is as reasonable, defensible, and well tested an interpretation of Reality as any other. Indeed no other presents, *on the whole*, so intrepid, rational, and livable a solution of the problem of existence" (p. 241).

Apologetics are often written in an obscure and unattractive form. Not the least of the merits of the volume under review is its lucidity and its attractive literary form. That the form ought to be regarded as a part of truth finds confirmation here.

JOHN ABERLY

The Philosophy of Christianity. By Leander S. Keyser, D.D.
Burlington, Ia.: The Lutheran Literary Board, 1928. 266
pages. \$2.25.

Philosophy is defined as a rationalized effort to give an adequate explanation of the universe and all its varied phenomena. The purpose of this book is to show that the Christian world view and its conception of the nature and destiny of man furnish, amidst all the various explanations that men have hazarded, the *only* adequate world view. That this adequate view has come through the revelation in the Scriptures, of which Jesus Christ is the completion, is to be received as a part of this philosophy.

In line with this purpose, Christian Theism is first considered as the only adequate view of Ultimate Reality, as over against Pantheism, Materialism and speculative Idealism. Our knowing processes are briefly passed under review and the rule to be followed in the search for truth is that "the only criterion of truth for every man is his cognition of it in his own soul, which is so constituted as to receive the truth" (p. 54). The Trinity, that difficult subject for the apologist, is yet the only view of God that can find a place for love and all the other perfections of holiness in the Godhead while avoiding Pluralism. The Incarnation gives us a view of God-with-us; at the same time a God who is forever above us. These discussions about God are followed by a consideration of man and particularly the moral universe which a study of man compels us to account for. The fact of sin dare not be overlooked as so many philosophies are tempted to do. Facing the real existence of sin and of man as a sinner, the necessity of the new birth must be admitted. A discussion of the reasonableness of faith concludes the argument of the book.

The author recognizes that the attempt to cover all these subjects in so small a volume is a huge task. Separate volumes on the different subjects could be, and have been, written. The book furnishes a guide to those who desire to have a bird's-eye view of the Christian world outlook as a whole and the reasons for holding to it. As is the case with all the arguments of the apologist, they will not of themselves convince one who does not know Christianity from the inside. They ought however to impress the one who looks at it only from the outside that even when viewed only as a philosophy Christianity best explains all the facts of the universe. The author, by bringing these arguments together in one volume, has rendered a very real service.

JOHN ABERLY

Philosophical Theology. Volume I: The Soul and Its Faculties.
By F. R. Tennant, D.D., B.Sc. Cambridge (England): The
University Press (New York: Macmillan), 1928. 418 pages.

In this volume, and in a second, not yet produced, Professor

Tennant undertakes to provide theological students with the complete material for the study of the "philosophy of religion," or, to use the phrase he prefers, "philosophical theology." Starting with psychology, he traverses a field which includes sociology, ethics, epistemology, and general metaphysics. The present volume is in a sense introductory to the main subject: the grounds for theism proper are to be taken up in the sequel. Yet the topics covered here are tremendously vital. A running outline may illustrate this.

Professor Tennant first announces, explains, and justifies his empirical method, showing clearly the collapse of the older rationalisms (Chapter I). After building up a consistent elementary psychology (II-IV), the author launches into the most capable defense of the existence of a personal self (or soul) that I have met, exposing relentlessly, and with fine irony, the inconsistencies of the many current theories of the non-existence of the unified, indivisible self (V). Defining what is meant by personality, over and above mere selfconsciousness, he proclaims, again with admirable skill, the freedom of the will, maintaining that most of the arguments against it, being mechanical, are meaningless in the mental sphere (VI). In a good discussion of value judgments, the basis of ethics, the writer claims that they are subjective, as indeed an empiricist would (VII); and in this connection it may be remarked that Professor Tennant later insists that religion can never be based upon, and reduced to, a higher ethic, after the pattern of Ritschlianism, past and modern, but must present distinctly theistic and metaphysical tenets (see pages 303-305). Thought, reason, and logic also become a subjective growth, and not eternal tools; rather than creating words to do their bidding, they arise from words, as words from impressions (VIII).

The author then undertakes a careful, illuminating survey of the formal theories of knowledge (IX and X). Vital subjects are still to follow: the difference between knowledge and belief, and proceeding from that, a careful psychological definition of faith (XI). Faith is the effort, the mental adventure, to establish as true something not yet verified, but not contradicted by anything known (pp. 297-300). Faith is the beginning of science, as well as of religion; wherefore science and religion are of the same kind (though dealing with different fields), both probable, neither certain, and can therefore be mutually compatible (p. 303; also XIII). In the discussion of religious experience (XII), the writer denies any special religious faculty to the soul, utterly rejecting such direct contact with reality as mysticism claims (pp. 311-324).

One can scarcely overstate the value of such a book as this to the student of theology. It has the supreme advantage of approaching all these important subjects empirically (that is, through experience). This is the modern approach; it enables the student

to cope with current scholarship. Then its completeness, its encyclopedic character, unifies a great deal of study that were otherwise done piecemeal and without correlation. It is no easy book to read. Professor Tennant has not written a facile, book-of-the-mouth "Story of Philosophy." Quite otherwise! Englishman that he is, he writes obscurely, with countless technicalities. I do not doubt that simpler language would have served him just as well. Nevertheless, his style has the merits of its defects. Behind atrocious verbiage the reader soon detects clear thinking; he masters a full technical vocabulary; and he finds himself face to face with the method of sifting out genuine arguments from false.

I can think of no book which could be studied by advanced theologues in seminar with more profit than this one. It would easily form the basis of an entire course. In the light of the present work, Professor Tennant's second volume will be awaited with eagerness.

THEODORE K. FINCK

Religion as Man's Completion, a Socio-Religious Study. By Rudolph N. Binder. New York: Harper and Brothers.

This is a study of religion from certain points of view characteristic of the twentieth century. In a sense it is an apologetic; it undertakes to vindicate the necessary and abiding value of religion, more especially of Christianity. It also presents a criticism of traditional interpretations of Christianity; it aims to show the necessity of a reinterpretation of Christianity in view of present day problems and needs.

The author believes that his method is scientific, that is, that he proceeds from the observed facts of religion. This involves the denial of what we ordinarily understand as revelation, practically if not formally. Religious inquiry is primarily and almost exclusively a voyage of discovery in the realm of religious life,—he would probably avoid the term "religious experience" as too subjective.

In general he holds to his theme,—Religion as Man's Completion, a Socio-Religious Study; he sets forth vigorously the fundamental place of religion among human interests. Though at times his metaphysical assumptions, often apparently unconsciously made, may be challenged, as well as his aesthetic theories, he argues forcefully that there is valid knowledge that is qualitatively different from the demonstrable knowledge of science. "What we have to show now are the following points: (1) that there exists valid knowledge not obtained by scientific methods; (2) that science, when passing beyond immediate facts, becomes a philosophy and loses its attribute of precision; (3) that nonscientific knowledge is as valuable, if not more so, as scientific; (4) that religion, as far as knowledge is concerned, is intermediate between science

and the arts." He resents the assumption that only such truth should be recognized as knowledge as is scientifically verifiable.

His assertion of the necessity of conceiving the object of religion as personal is splendidly grounded. His appreciation of the dignity and importance of human personality is well stated, though his attempt to give a genetic account of it requires great faith—might I say credulity—on the part of the reader.

Professor Binder rejects revelation in the sense of a special direct communication from God to man, as well as certain central doctrines of orthodox evangelical Christianity. There are some hasty generalizations and unproved assumptions. Protestant theology is conceived almost exclusively as Calvinistic legalism theocentrically grounded. But the book is a strong and thought-provoking discussion of living problems. Professor Binder has a message. His book is stimulating; you cannot read it and be indifferent. You may disagree with it, as I believe all evangelical Christians will, but you must reckon with it.

S. G. HEFELBOWER

Symbolism, Its Meaning and Effect. By Alfred North Whitehead. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Last year Professor Whitehead delivered a series of three lectures at the University of Virginia, on the Barbour-Page Foundation. Under the above title these lectures have been given to a larger audience.

The book is difficult to understand, as Professor Whitehead's books generally are; but the patient reader will be well rewarded. He discusses the nature, the necessity, and certain applications of symbolism in human thought and action. The fore part of the book is technical, and at times hard to follow; the last lecture is intended to suggest certain practical applications in the field of social problems.

The average man of culture little realizes how much we depend on symbols in our thinking. Without them our mental life would be essentially different from what it now is, and on a distinctly lower level; in fact, it would scarcely be human, at least it would not be human as we now conceive it.

Much of his discussion in the first two lectures is in the field of epistemology. He tries to be a consistent realist and at the same time recognize the truth of the idealistic theory of knowledge; but frequently it is very evident that he is more zealous than successful in his effort.

S. G. HEFELBOWER

The Pilgrimage of Buddhism. By James B. Pratt. New York: Macmillan Company, 1928. xii + 758 pages. \$3.00.

Dr. Pratt is best known as the author of *The Religious Con-*

sciousness. He has also made a special study of Indian religions and Buddhism. The results of his studies about Buddhism are given us in this volume. In it the author aims to give the reader not so much the history and the traditional teachings of Buddhism, though these are also briefly given, as the facts about present-day Buddhism that make it a living force in the religious life of our day. It is to be regretted that the only form of Buddhism with which the reviewer has come into close personal contact—that of Nepal on the borders of Thibet—as also the Buddhism of Thibet is not covered in this pilgrimage. This is left out deliberately as it is not considered real Buddhism but only animism with a Buddhistic veneer. It would however seem that even so it ought to be included in as comprehensive study of Buddhism as is presented to us in this volume.

The author takes us first through the countries in which the Hinayana or Southern Buddhism prevails. These are Ceylon, Burma, Siam and Cambodia. By far the larger part of the book is however taken up with Mahayana or Northern Buddhism. This covers the Buddhism found in China, Korea, and Japan. One would like to know the author's authority for the view expressed that Buddhism ceased in India because of the fall of Magadha, its stronghold, before the Mohammedan conquerors (pp. 114, 115). It is to be remembered that, as India before the time of its being conquered by the Moslems has practically no history, there is much room for one's imagination to reconstruct that period. However it is commonly held that the revival of Hinduism under the Reformers beginning with Sankaracharya in the ninth century, together with the absorption of it by Hinduism, which has always shown itself responsive to its environment, was responsible for its disappearance from India. We notice also that while the author's pilgrimage took him to Central and Northern India, it evidently passed by the interesting Buddhist remains in South India at Amaravati and Bhattiprolu. However a book that undertakes to cover as vast an area as does this one, must, of necessity, omit a good deal that a complete consideration of the subject would require.

The author's attitude towards Buddhism is sympathetic at the same time that he makes no secret of the fact that he considers Christianity of the more liberal type superior to it. His attitude towards mission work is one of appreciation though he distinguishes between the more liberal and the extreme fundamentalist type and has very little good to say of the latter. Here we believe the author's contact with only the one class of people represented by the intelligentsia and not with the more general work in the villages has led him to a wrong estimate of their work and its results. Occasionally the author takes advantage of an occasion to give his views on some subject in general rather than confining

himself to Buddhism. We instance his views on prayer in general (pp. 556, 557) the value of which he stresses though he allows altogether too little place for petitionary prayer.

Taking the book as a whole, it makes interesting reading. The author and his fellow pilgrim, who, we are given to understand, was his wife, bids the reader share not only in his pilgrimage but also in his observations and reflections. These are always interesting even though one may find occasion to question some of them. Any one desiring a survey of Buddhist lands and peoples under the guidance of a keen observer and thinker will have his wishes fully met by a perusal of this interesting pilgrimage.

JOHN ABERLY

PRACTICAL THEOLOGY

American Lutheran Preaching. Edited by Miles H. Krumbine. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1928. 301 pages. \$2.50.

In recent years a large number of sermon volumes has appeared, presenting somewhat of a bird's-eye view of the current preaching in England, Scotland, Canada, the United States and elsewhere. Joseph Fort Newton's annual volumes of "Best Sermons" have given a considerable impetus to sermon publication. A volume on "American Lutheran Preaching" was to be expected and is thoroughly in order.

Dr. Krumbine presents in this volume sermons by twenty-five Lutheran ministers. Taken as a whole, the volume measures up quite well with other recent sermon volumes in point of thought, development, and style. There are three or four outstanding sermons in the volume; the rest are rather typical than unusual. As a cross section of our American Lutheran preaching today, the volume is quite fair. It does not, generally speaking, present our foremost preachers nor does it present the best preaching of the men whose sermons are included. It does strike a pretty good average.

There is considerable spiritual insight and spiritual power in the sermons; there is an evident endeavor to present truth in a form attractive and intelligible to the modern mind; there is, in places, an earnest grappling with present day problems. On the other hand there is a very noticeable lack of sermons on the great central themes of Christianity. The preaching is largely, to use the expression of another reader of the volume, "peripheral." True to the whole modern American tendency in preaching, for better or for worse, expository preaching is almost entirely wanting; texts are little more than starting points; outlines are discarded; and language is used that is aesthetic rather than exact. In spite of its patent defects, the volume deserves a place among the sermon books of our day.

PAUL J. HOH

Religious Education. By Theodore Gerald Soares. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928. XX + 336 pages. \$2.50.

In this volume the author suggests some fundamental studies that have been found essential in a course in the Principles of Religious Education. The subject matter was first assembled for The Earl Lectures at The Pacific School of Religion at Berkeley, California, in February 1927. This matter was later expanded into the present effort to restate the theory of Religious Education, and to provide a suitable text book for colleges and other schools offering courses in this new but important field.

The author approaches his task with the rich heritage of experience as a professor in the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, and a leader in the practical field of religious endeavor in his home city. As former president of the R. E. A. his broad contacts have made possible an acquaintance with the whole range of leadership and theory in this fast developing science.

The scope of the work can best be secured from a glance at the table of contents. After a brief introduction stating the author's conception of the meaning of Religious Education he studies the theories of human nature, the individual and the group, habits and ideals, religion as folkways and the Christian ideal. The next three chapters deal with education through the socialized group, as directed experience and as organized knowledge. In these chapters the author touches the heart of the educative process. A chapter each is given to the meaning of curriculum, education through moral crises, revaluation of prejudice, deliberative conduct and the will of God, the experience of a churchman, worship as an organizing experience, and education in worship.

The treatment throughout is clear, definite and directed with the scientific skill one would expect in the author. Some of his statements will challenge minds of conservative habits and compel more than one reading. Yet every page breathes the candor of an earnest believer in search of life's great truths.

Each chapter contains stimulating directions for further study. These call for more attention than the average reader will be able to give, but will reward in most fruitful manner all who can find opportunity for detailed study of the suggestions offered. The author also suggests that the student write his own autobiography. No one can follow the directions given without rich returns for his efforts in a clearer understanding of his own life, and a deeper appreciation of the many factors that combine in making life attractive, challenging and fruitful.

M. HADWIN FISCHER

The Ministry of Love. A study book in which special attention is given to the merciful activities of the Church. By Foster U. Gift, D.D., Superintendent of Instruction at the Lutheran Deaconess Motherhouse, Baltimore, Md. Philadelphia: United Lutheran Publication House, 1928. 145 pages. 75 cents.

This is the fourth of a series of "Key Books" dealing with the practical activities of the United Lutheran Church. The series is under the general editorship of Dr. F. H. Knubel, President of the United Lutheran Church, and Dr. M. G. G. Scherer, the Secretary. Dr. Gift is qualified for his task by his enthusiasm for the ministry of Christian love and his years of experience in training those who seek specific service in that field.

The author has divided his discussion into eight chapters under the following captions: I. Christian Love; II. Its Ways; III. Its Works (General); IV. Its Work, Part One—Inner Mission Ideals and Activities; V. Its Work, Part One—Ministerial Pensions and Relief; Part Two,—The National Lutheran Council; VI. Its Workers; VII. Its Workers and Their Training; VIII. Its Workers, Their Support and Care. Four appendices are added, the first devoted to the Inner Mission Board, with a classification of institutions at its close; the second, to the Deaconess and Her Ministry; the third, to the Board of Ministerial Pensions and Relief; and the fourth, to the National Lutheran Council.

Dr. Gift has made the church his debtor by this painstaking presentation of the practical side of our inner mission work. We can give no higher commendation than to say that he has accomplished what he set out to do.

H. C. ALLEMAN

OLD TESTAMENT

The Second Isaiah: A New Interpretation. By Charles C. Torrey. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928. xii + 477 pages. \$5.00.

The book which bears the name of the great prophet of Jerusalem in the last third of the eighth century B. C. has been more diligently studied by critical scholars than any other of the Prophets. The list of titles on the book is amazing, and the end is not yet. Until 1780 the unitary authorship of the book was not questioned. In that year J. B. Koppe, in a German translation of Bishop Lowth's Commentary, questioned it, regarding chapter 50 as written by Ezekiel or some other prophet of the exile. In 1789 Doederlein, in the preface to his *Esaias*, considered it perfectly obvious that chapters 40-66 came from an anonymous prophet living near the close of the exile. Thenceforward the theory of a "second Isaiah" gained in favor until it became the accepted criti-

cal assumption. Then in 1892 Bernard Duhm challenged the exilic date of chapters 56-66, on the manifestly Palestinian setting of these chapters, and proposed a "third Isaiah," a thesis which has met with wide acceptance. Three Isaiahs, however, have not satisfied all the critical scholars. R. H. Kennett in the Sweich Lectures, 1910, proposed five, assigning the largest part of the book to an author of the second century B. C.

Professor Torrey thinks two Isaiahs are all the book requires, but he introduces a new "second Isaiah." Years ago he was led by his Ezra studies to doubt the historicity of Ezra and the return of any considerable company from the Babylonian exile. "No writer," he says, "prior to the third century B. C. shows any knowledge of such an event, whether under Cyrus or at any other time." It was this conclusion, arrived at in his Ezra studies that became the starting-point of his fresh study of Isaiah. He suspected the references to Cyrus and Babylon in the text; hence he set to work to master its metric forms. By his reading of the lines, "to Babylon" and "to Chaldea" in chapter 43 and the mention of Cyrus in chapters 44 and 45 are awkward, later interpolations in the interest of the Chronicler's theory of the Babylonian exile and return. He finds, instead, that the poems of the latter part of Isaiah—and he finds this unity in chapters 34 to 66 (with the exception of the historical chapters 36-39, an interlocking insertion at this point by an editor who sought thus to give them the authority of Isaiah's name)—are the work of a single author, a poet-prophet of the highest rank, who addresses twenty-seven continuous poems to his brethren of the diaspora.

Prof. Torrey's theory is that the poems are the work of a prophet of Jerusalem near the end of the fifth century B. C. or about 407-400 B. C. They have no Babylonian background and are not concerned with any return of "exiles" from that land. There was a dispersion of Hebrews into all neighboring lands beginning centuries before the fall of the Southern Kingdom and stimulated by the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B. C. The poems are a ringing call, in the face of national disintegration, to the faith of the fathers and a revival of the sense of mission.

This idea is best expressed in Prof. Torrey's own words: "With the national existence seemingly gone forever, and the humiliation of 'the chosen people' daily increasing, what was the meaning of the promises to Abraham, the deliverance from Egypt and the throne of David? If these things had but a local and temporary significance, then the religion of Yahwè had had its day, it was time for something new." But the "second Isaiah" saw that "the hoarded property of a small people was intended to become the property of the world. . . . It had been plain even to the Gentiles that Israel was 'punished, smitten of God and afflicted' in this age of light and enterprise more than at any other time. . . . He has

the mission of announcing 'new things, things kept in store, not hitherto known' (48:6f., 42:9). His message culminates in divine announcements: to Israel, triumph and restoration in the Coming Age, which he pictures as close at hand; to the Gentile world, light and life, obtained through Israel; to both, Messianic leader and benefactor" (pp. 66, 67).

According to Prof. Torrey the so-called Servant Songs (42:1-4, 49:1-6, 50:4-9, 52:13-53:12) are not to be regarded as ancient lyrics celebrating the experience of an historical character or as later interpolations, as some scholars have thought. They are integral with the other poems. They celebrate the nation's origin. Their theme is Abraham and his call, Jacob and the nation that sprang from his loins, and the commanding figure of the Messiah. They exhort Hebrews everywhere to remember "the rock from which they were hewn and the pit from which they were digged." The hope of Israel lies not in a return of an insignificant remnant from Babylon but in the homecoming of the diaspora and their spiritual rebirth.

This, in brief, is the "new interpretation." It is most ably presented and defended. In his development of his theory of the metric forms of Isaiah, justifying his excision of "Cyrus" and "Babylon," the author has made an entirely new translation of chapters 34-66 which is illuminating and helpful. He has also appended a commentary which preserves the method of linguistic study by which he arrived at many of his translations. The volume is altogether a notable contribution to the literature in Isaiah.

In order to evaluate the thesis of Prof. Torrey one should be a specialist in Hebrew metrics. Our reaction to it must rest on other ground. To begin with, chapter 34 has no apparent relation to what follows and is an infelicitous introduction to Prof. Torrey's "Second Isaiah." It is a link which makes for the unity of Isaiah, the place for which is with chapters 13-23, and the climax of which is chapter 63.

Again, after re-reading the text we are impressed with the question afresh, If there is to be a "second Isaiah," why not a third? No theory which assigns 40-66 to a "second Isaiah" alone seems quite satisfactory. Chapters 55-66 are occupied with another set of interests altogether different from those of 40-55.

Again, the prophetic literature of the O. T. (which includes Deuteronomy) has a definite historic setting. What experience is to the individual, history was to corporate Israel. Israel had the unforgettable memory of its call out of the old Semitic polytheism, its deliverance from the bondage of Egypt—why should the return from the Babylonian exile, also a tradition, alone be thought a fiction? Even with the excision of "Cyrus" and the Babylonian references we have not got rid of the Babylonian background. A

"civilization" is reflected which was never that of Palestine—especially that of the fifth century B. C. As Prof. Willett has said, "The passages that refer to Cyrus are in no way appropriate either to the patriarch Abraham or the Servant of Jahveh, whether interpreted nationally or ideally."

It was Kusters, the Dutch scholar, who first denied the return from Babylonia under an edict from Cyrus, as described by Ezra, and the immediate beginning of the rebuilding of the temple. He based his denial, 1) on the silence of Haggai and Zechariah as to any return; 2) on the nature of Ez. 5-16:18, which he takes to be a composite of two contradictory documents, in neither of which is there any mention of a decree of Cyrus permitting a *return*, and, 3) on the assumption that the list of names in Ezra 2 was borrowed from Neh. 7. The argument from silence in 1) and 2) has not been convincing. Sir George Adam Smith makes these points: 1) If Haggai and Zechariah are silent about a return under Cyrus they are also silent about the future—they do not predict a return under Nehemiah. 2) They are silent about mixed marriages and lax Sabbath observance, for which there was time enough among a "people of the land" but not among a returned remnant. 3) They have nothing to say about idols—an indication that they were addressing those who had profited by the discipline of the captivity. 4) If the temple was built by "the people of the land" why do Ezra and Nehemiah regard them with such contempt? To which Whitehouse adds the points: 1) We have to account for the story itself; 2) likewise for the preservation of the oracles of II Isaiah. "If they express the expectation, nourished by the prophet and his contemporaries, then it is clear from their preservation for future generations that Cyrus did not disappoint the hope of the exiles from whose midst the voice appealed to him." 3) The return was in harmony with Cyrus' policy. 4) It is likewise in harmony with the Elephantine papyri.

These are considerations which Prof. Torrey dismisses too cavalierly. He concedes little to the persistence of tradition and the consensus of other scholars. He is very confident that he has made his case. A challenge so sincere and masterful cannot fail of its goal, namely, the re-examination of the whole question of Isaiah's Prophecy and, particularly, a fresh apprehension of the Servant of Jehovah. His theory (which includes chapters 61, 62 and 63 among the Servant Songs) preserves this figure in its integrity—and this is the strongest argument for it.

H. C. ALLEMAN

The Study Bible: Genesis. By E. Griffith-Jones, D.D., and A. C. Welch, D.D. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company, 1928. 143 pages.

The old-fashioned commentary is coming back. The Study Bible

gives first place to the religious values of the books and a subsidiary place to critical discussion. The general editor, John Stirling, has assembled a corps of writers—Dean Inge, Principal Garvie, Prof. James Moffatt, Prof. A. S. Peake, etc.—whose names guarantee the quality of the material, while the notes and comments are drawn from the writings of scholars of all periods of Christian history, so that each volume is both a commentary and a symposium.

The volume on Genesis is done by Dr. E. Griffith Jones and Dr. A. C. Welch and sets a high mark for the series.

H. C. ALLEMAN

A New Commentary on Holy Scripture. Edited by Bishop Gore, D.D., H. L. Goudge, D.D., and A. Guillaume. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928. 697 + 158 + 743 pages. \$5.00.

This monumental work is a volume of 1600 pages, but the fact that it is printed on India paper, flexibly bound, makes it a convenient handbook. This type of work is at once a tribute to the vitality of the scholarship of the Christian church and at the same time a commentary on the trend of our times. This is a day of "gists," generalizations, etc. We have The Story of Science, The Story of History, The Story of Music, The Story of Christianity, and the end is not yet. In many respects this work is The Story of the Christian Tradition. The fact that Bishop Gore is the senior general editor, who has added his own notes to some of the outstanding contributions, is a guarantee that the Commentary, though the work of fifty-six collaborators together with the three editors, possesses a marked unity.

It is natural to compare this one-volume commentary with Prof. Peake's. While similar in method and of about equal scholarship, there is a marked difference between them. It is the difference between the subjective and the objective. In Prof. Peake's Commentary we have psychological unity, in Bishop Gore's unity of faith as resting upon the Christian tradition. This difference appears in the introductory articles on the Bible. The former quotes with approval Dr. Dale's well-known words, "The idea of the authority of the Book (he is speaking of the New Testament) as a book is hardly ever thought of. The Book—explain it how we may—vanishes. The truth read there shines in its own light." In other words, the authority of the Book is the authority of its power to create a given reaction in the soul of the reader. On the other hand, the heart of Bishop Gore's interpretation seems to lie in these words:

"From this point of view the relation of the teaching Church to the Scriptures is easy to establish. The Church with its tradition comes first. It was there before the Scriptures were written. All the books of the New Testament presuppose it, and no one of them.

is intended to give the first teaching to the Catechumen. To use Athanasius' expression, it remains the function of the Church to give to the disciple his 'point of view' (*scopos*). Without this traditional instruction as to the Threefold Name, the Incarnation, the Mission of the Spirit, the Church, the Sacraments, the moral duties, the Last Things (all of which the New Testament presupposes), an individual left to himself to find his own way about in the books would be fairly sure to come to grief. But when he has received his point of view and his creed from the Church, he is to build himself up in fuller assurance and knowledge in the books; and this familiarity with the books on the part of both teacher and taught is to keep the tradition itself from corruption and onesidedness."

These ruling principles determine the nature of each book. Peake's book is an encyclopedia on the Bible. The thirty special articles occupy fully a third of the one thousand and fourteen pages and they deal with every phase of the life of Israel, and, later, of the Christian community, which would throw light upon the message. Bishop Gore's book devotes itself more exclusively to the text, the Commentary on the Books of the Old Testament occupying 511 pages, that on the Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament, 129, and that on the New Testament, 553. It is characteristic of the method of Prof. Peake's work that it gives 587 pages to the Old Testament and 427 to the New. Bishop Gore's book devotes 697 to the Old Testament and 743 to the New. We miss, in the former, any exposition of the Suffering Servant and any commitment to—yes, even statement of—the doctrine of the Virgin Birth. Bishop Gore contributes a positive article on The Virgin Birth of our Lord. There are also articles on The Evidence of the Resurrection, The New Testament and the Catholic Creeds, The Sacraments in the New Testament, and The Constitution of the Church of the New Testament (written from the viewpoint of the Catholic party of the Church of England).

With respect to Biblical criticism both books have about the same position. The work of criticism is accepted. Peake's Commentary is a brilliant application of its principles by the best known English scholars. Bishop Gore, who has done so much to reconcile the old faith with the new knowledge, has adopted the same principles but has seen to it that the interpretation of the books hews the line of the Christian tradition.

If one were to ask, Which shall we buy? our answer would be, Both—or neither. After all, the one-volume commentary is yet to be made which is sufficient for the pastor's library. It were well to have these two volumes as Introductions to the Bible, but the best commentary would be the selected individual treatment of the books. Unfortunately we do not as yet possess a uniform series in English.—H. C. ALLEMAN.

Increasingly pastors are asked, or ought to be asked, by intelligent laymen and Sunday school teachers to recommend a one-volume commentary on the Bible. With the materials ordinarily supplied to them they find it difficult or even impossible to acquire adequate knowledge of the totality of ancient life which produced the Bible. On the other hand, the more detailed histories and the more extended commentaries are, by reason of limited time and money, usually beyond reach. Pastors will therefore be interested in an examination of this commentary with the "ordinary reader" or "elementary student" for whom it is written in mind.

Part II, *The Apocrypha*, begins with an article by Edwin Bevan on the Environment Social, Political, Intellectual, and Religious, of Israel from Maccabees to our Lord. This, plus a study of the apocryphal books themselves, will correct the perspective by which the average Bible reader too commonly views those marvelous centuries between the Old Testament and the New as dark, hidden, mysterious or decadent: Jewish life will be seen as it really was, vitally a part of and related to the life of the ancient world from which Christianity emerged and in which it developed.

Further information concerning the ancient world is furnished by the first three articles of Part III, *The New Testament: The Political Background; The Religious Background of the New Testament in Jewish Thought; and The Gentile Background of Early Christianity*. Much material is here conveniently condensed. The discussion of the Mystery Religions (pp. 30-32) is, however, inadequate. The problems of relationship between these cults and early Christianity are not really faced, but are rather summarily dismissed by an "improbable" or "it is very hard to believe." Notwithstanding limitations of space, the importance of this subject certainly demanded fuller treatment.

Other special articles are: *The Synoptic Problem; The Teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ, with an Outline of His Life; The Knowledge of Christ Incarnate; The Theology of St. Paul; New Testament Prophecy and Apocalyptic; The Sacred Sites of the Gospel; The Textual Criticism of the New Testament; The Chronology of the New Testament*.

In these articles, and in the comments on the books themselves, the reader will occasionally note the special ecclesiastical and apologetic interests of the writers. In the light of their views he will re-examine his own. When, for example, in the section on Faith and Works, a Lutheran reads that "any doctrine of being accounted or declared righteous which separates it from consecration and practical redemption is contrary to St. Paul's mind and most dangerous; and the doctrine of Luther as generally understood undoubtedly does this" (p. 433), he is being amply repaid for his own confident assertion that the heart of the Gospel beats weakly in other Protestant denominations. He may be reminded of Lessing's parable of the alarm of fire in the King's palace, which, instead of a rush to put out the fire, sent the servants

scurrying, each to save his own possessions and to argue whose portion of the building was burning. "By their fruits ye shall know them."

Some examples of conclusions concerning date, place, authorship an authenticity will enable the reader to judge the general critical position of the writers. Mark, the disciple of Peter, wrote his Gospel in Rome "somewhere about the year A. D. 65" (p. 42). The actual author of Matthew is "a compiler rather than an original authority; and he does not claim, as even St. Luke does, to be more than this." Since, however, the Gospel according to St. Matthew gives more fully than any other the contents of Q, "there was but little error in attaching it to the Apostle's name" (p. 125). The traditional authorship of Luke is maintained. Whether in its finished form it is dated in 80 or in 65 A. D., is as regards its trustworthiness, "of very little importance if it is recognized that St. Luke was a trustworthy historian, who took pains to get at first-hand evidence; that the narrative, so far as it does not depend on Mark was drawn up at Caesarea by A. D. 59" (p. 209). The Fourth Gospel may date from any year after A. D. 75, but can scarcely be later than 115—thus W. Lock, who is not explicit as to authorship (pp. 242-3). C. Harris in an appended note defends the traditional position (pp. 272-6).

In all such questions the preacher will find in these brief discussions a welcome summary, and the layman will have a useful guide in getting at the heart of the problems and interpretations involved. Only he must realize that in many cases further study will be necessary before he is entitled to an opinion. A case in point is the Introduction to Hebrews which adopts the position that the letter was written to Jewish Christians in danger of relapsing into Judaism (p. 597). Unless the reader continues his study by examining the positions of such commentators as James Moffatt and E. F. Scott, he can have no adequate impression of the arguments in favor of interpreting the epistle as addressed to Gentile Christians at Rome whose danger was not a relapse into Judasim, but indifference to the supreme values of Christianity, an indifference which threatened disaster in the face of oncoming persecutions. So, too, when the Pauline authorship of Ephesians is maintained, one must note and weigh carefully the arguments in favor of regarding it as an introduction to the whole body of Paul's letters, written by those who collected them.

Can the average church member be interested in such study? The negative is too readily assumed. Measured by its confessional attitude, the church needs to make a far more serious study of the Scriptures. Men need to see with their own eyes just what the Bible is; but to see it their eyes must be opened. That is the function of the Commentary. The modest hope of the editors is "that it will be found—not perfect, but useful. Useful it certainly will be; and it is to be hoped that many will be brought to see the importance of using it.

BOOKS RECEIVED

For the information of its readers and in acknowledgment to the publishers The Lutheran Church Quarterly publishes the following list of books received. More extended notice will be given later to as many of them as space permits.

- Atkins, Gaius Glenn, *Reinspecting Victorian Religion*. Macmillan, 1928. 151 pages. \$1.75.
- Baillie, John, *The Interpretation of Religion*. Scribner's, 1928. 477 pages. \$4.00.
- Barbour, Dorothy Dickinson, *Making the Bible Desired*. Doubleday, Doran, 1928. 146 pages. \$1.50.
- Bartholomew, E. F., *Biblical Pedagogy*. Augustana Book Concern, 1927. 131 pages. \$0.90.
- Boreham, F. W., *The Fiery Crags*. 285 pages. \$1.75. *A Temple of Topaz*. 272 pages. \$1.75. Abingdon Press, 1928.
- Bridges, Horace James, *Taking the Name of Science in Vain*. Macmillan, 1928. 272 pages. \$2.50.
- Chevalier, Jacques, *Henri Bergson*. Macmillan, 1928. 351 pages. \$2.50.
- Collier, Frank W., *John Wesley among the Scientists*. Abingdon Press, 1928. 351 pages. \$2.00.
- Czarnomska, Elizabeth, *The Authentic Literature of Israel*, Vol. II. Macmillan, 1928. 552 pages. \$5.00.
- Dallmann, William, *The Christian*. Concordia Publishing House, 1928. 221 pages.
- Davies, T. H., *The Gospel of the Living Jesus*. Macmillan, 1928. 237 pages. \$2.25.
- Davis, Ozora S., *The Credentials of the Church*. Macmillan, 1928. 115 pages. \$1.25.
- Day, Albert Edward, *Present Perils in Religion*. Abingdon Press, 1928. 215 pages. \$1.25.
- Diamond, Herbert Maynard, *Religion and the Commonweal. An Analysis of the Social Economy of Religion*. Harper & Bros., 1928. 305 pages. \$2.00.
- Duren, William Larkin, *Francis Asbury, Founder of American Methodism and unofficial Minister of State*. Macmillan, 1928. 270 pages. \$3.00.
- Edland, Elisabeth, *The Children's King and Other Plays for Children*. Abingdon Press, 1928. 78 pages. \$0.75.
- Eggleston, Margaret W., *More Fireside Stories for Girls in Their Teens*. Doubleday, Doran, 1928. 153 pages. \$1.25.
- Fahling, Adam, *German Gospel Sermons with English Outlines*. Concordia Publ. House, 1928. 428 pages.

- Family Service Book, The.* United Lutheran Publ. House, 1928. 361 pages.
- Fanshawe, John E., *Education for Tolerance.* Independent Education, 1928. 30 pages.
- Fenner, Mabel B., *God's Good Gifts. Primary—Third Year. Religious Education Texts. Pupil's Book.* 156 pages. \$0.60. *Teacher's Book.* 180 pages. \$0.85. United Lutheran Publ. House, 1928.
- Fife, Robert H., *Young Luther.* Macmillan, 1928. 228 pages. \$2.00.
- Freeman, James E., *The Ambassador.* Macmillan, 1928. 212 pages. \$2.00.
- Garber, Paul Neff, *That Fighting Spirit of Methodism.* Piedmont Press, 1928. 199 pages. \$1.50.
- Garrison, Winfred Ernest, *Affirmative Religion.* Harper & Bros., 1928. 292 pages. \$2.00.
- Gerfen, Ernst Emil, *Luther unter vier Paepsten.* Lutheran Book Concern, 1928. 104 pages. \$0.75.
- Gilkey, J. G., *The Certainty of God.* Macmillan, 1928. 220 pages. \$1.75.
- Graebner, Theo., *Handbook for Congregational Officers.* 1928. 252 pages. \$1.25. *The Story of the Catechism.* 1928. 147 pages. \$0.75. *Touring with God. Devotions for Christian Pilgrims.* 1927. 192 pages. Concordia Publ. House.
- Grant, Frederick C., *New Horizons of the Christian Faith.* Morehouse Publ. Co., 1928. 287 pages. \$1.50.
- Gray, Joseph M. M., *Concerning the Faith. Some Essays at Understanding.* Abingdon Press, 1928. 293 pages. \$2.00.
- Grote, Herman, *Hymn Interludes.* Concordia Publ. House, 1927. 258 pages.
- Hägglund, S. G., *Henric Schartau and the Order of Grace.* Augustana Book Concern, 1928. 216 pages. \$1.25.
- Harley, William, *Tomahawk and Cross.* Lutheran Book Concern, 1928. 327 pages. \$1.25.
- Harper, W. A., *Character Building in Colleges.* Abingdon Press, 1928. 237 pages. \$1.50.
- Hayes, Doremus A., *The Heights of Christian Blessedness.* Abingdon Press, 1928. 393 pages. \$2.50.
- Hurst, George L., *The Literary Background of the New Testament.* Macmillan, 1928. 163 pages. \$1.50.
- Jefferson, Charles E., *Cardinal Ideas of Jeremiah.* Macmillan, 1928. 220 pages. \$2.00.
- Jones, E. Stanley, *Christ at the Round Table.* Abingdon Press, 1928. 328 pages. \$1.50.
- Jones, Rufus M., *The New Quest.* Macmillan, 1928. 202 pages. \$1.75.

- Juergens, Sylvester P., *Newman on the Psychology of Faith*. Macmillan, 1928. 281 pages. \$2.75.
- Jung, Leo, *The Jewish Library*. Macmillan, 1928. 374 pages. \$2.50.
- Junior Hymnal, The. Authorized by the Evangelical Lutheran Augustana Synod.* Augustana Book Concern, 1928. 296 pages. \$1.50.
- Keyser, Leander S., *A Handbook of Christian Psychology*. Lutheran Literary Board, 1928. 169 pages. \$1.50.
- Kretzmann, Paul E., *John Ludwig Krapf*. Lutheran Book Concern, 1928. 159 pages. \$0.50. *Search the Scriptures! Vols. VII and VIII. A Series of Graded Bible Lesson Outlines for the Use of Bible Classes.* Concordia Publ. House, 1928. *What Lutheran Sunday-School Teachers Should Know.* Concordia Publ. House, 1928. 98 pages.
- Kupky, Oscar, *The Religious Development of Adolescents*. Macmillan, 1928. 138 pages.
- Lankenau, F. J., *The World is Our Field. A Missionary Survey*. Concordia Publ. House, 1928. 279 pages. \$1.50.
- Leh, L. L., *Christianity Reborn*. Macmillan, 1928. 221 pages. \$2.00.
- Lesson Commentary for Sunday Schools, 1929.* United Lutheran Publ. House, 1928. 316 pages. \$1.75.
- Lillehei, L., *Augsburg Seminary and the Lutheran Free Church*. Minneapolis, Minn. 200 pages.
- Luccock, Halford E., *Preaching Values in New Translations of the New Testament*. Abingdon Press, 1928. 312 pages. \$2.00.
- Lugan, Alphonse, *Social Principles of the Gospel*. Macmillan, 1928. 262 pages. \$2.25.
- McConnell, Francis John, *Humanism and Christianity*. Macmillan, 1928. 153 pages. \$1.75.
- McDowell, William Fraser, *That I May Save Some*. Abingdon Press, 1928. 180 pages. \$1.00.
- Machen, J. Gresham, *The Origin of Paul's Religion*. Macmillan, 1928 (reissue). 329 pages. \$2.75.
- Marchant, Sir James, *If I Had Only One Sermon to Preach*. Harper & Bros., 1928. 307 pages. \$2.50.
- Mathews, Shailer, *Jesus on Social Institutions*. Macmillan, 1928. 158 pages. \$1.50.
- Mozley, J. K., *The Doctrine of God. Three Lectures*. Macmillan, 1928. 126 pages.
- Murry, J. Middleton, *Things to Come*. Macmillan, 1928. 318 pages. \$2.50.
- Mueller, John Theodore, *Luther's Small Catechism 1529-1929*. Lutheran Book Concern, 1928. 37 pages. \$0.65.
- Newton, Joseph Fort, *Altar Stairs*. Macmillan, 1928. 205 pages. \$2.25.